The Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks

CHURCH ORNAMENTS AND THEIR CIVIL ANTECEDENTS

JUL 1 1917

BV 167 .L43 1917
Legg, J. Wickham 1843-1921.
Church ornaments and their
civil antecedents

The Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study

General Editors:

H. B. Swete, D.D.

J. H. Srawley, D.D.

CHURCH ORNAMENTS AND THEIR CIVIL ANTECEDENTS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

CHURCH ORNAMENTS AND THEIR CIVIL ANTECEDENTS

BY

J. WICKHAM LEGG

Hon. Doctor of Letters in the University of Oxford;
Chairman of the Council of the Henry Bradshaw
Liturgical Text Society

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1917

NOTE BY THE EDITORS

THE purpose of *The Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study* is to offer to students who are entering upon the study of Liturgies such help as may enable them to proceed with advantage to the use of the larger and more technical works upon the subject which are already at their service.

The series will treat of the history and rationale of the several rites and ceremonies which have found a place in Christian worship, with some account of the ancient liturgical books in which they are contained. Attention will also be called to the importance which liturgical forms possess as expressions of Christian conceptions and beliefs.

Each volume will provide a list or lists of the books in which the study of its subject may be pursued, and will contain a Table of Contents and an Index.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions expressed in the several volumes of the series. While offering suggestions on points of detail, they have left each writer to treat his subject in his own way, regard being had to the general plan and purpose of the series.

H. B. S.
J. H. S.

PREFACE

AT the beginning of this work it would not be right to omit an expression of the liveliest feelings of gratitude to two friends of long standing; the Rev. H. A. Wilson, of Magdalen College, and the Rev. Dr Kidd, Hon. Canon of Christ Church. To the latter I am indebted for the suggestion that such a work as this should be undertaken; to the former, for much help, encouragement, and almost daily correction of what had been written, or what had already been committed to the press.

How deeply I am under obligation to the great library of the British Museum will be clear to every one who may turn over the following pages: especially do I owe much to Mr J. P. Gilson, Keeper of the Manuscripts; Mr G. F. Hill, Keeper of Coins and Medals; and Mr Arthur I. Ellis, Assistant in the Printed Book Department, who has often enabled me to consult books which from imperfect information I could not find in the excellent and almost unrivalled catalogue of the Printed Books of this magnificent institution. In the Bodleian Library, the assistance of Mr T. Gambier-Parry has been given to me, as ever, in the most generous manner.

Much assistance has been given to me by Mr E. Thurlow Leeds, F.S.A., at the Ashmolean Museum, in examining the casts of the consular diptychs which are under his care, and in giving permission for such to be photographed.

The Rev. Dr Bannister has taken great pains with the photographs which illustrate some portions of the following pages. For instance, I am much indebted to him for his goodness in obtaining for me the photograph of the drawing of the *Praefectus Annonae*, now in the Vatican, which is reproduced in the fifth chapter. And I must also thank the Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* for permission to make use of material contained in an article already printed in the April number of that Review in 1916, on which is based the fifth chapter of this following work.

I am indeed grateful for much kindness on many occasions to one whom I may be allowed to name here, the Reverend H. B. Swete, D.D., Emeritus Professor in the University of Cambridge; particularly on this occasion am I grateful to him and to the Venerable Dr Srawley, Archdeacon of Wisbech, for their flattering recommendation of the book to the Syndics of the Cambridge Press for publication in their Series of Liturgical Handbooks.

When this little work was approaching publication it had the good fortune to come

under the notice of no less an antiquary than Mr G. M°N. Rushforth, to whom I am indebted for much information and valuable criticism, of which I have tried in the following pages to take the most advantage that could be, considering the advanced stage of preparation in which the work then was.

I have also the pleasure of thanking Messrs Longman for permission to reproduce Plate v. from S. R. Gardiner's *Student's History of England.*

In the same way, I would thankfully acknowledge that I am indebted to Mr T. R. Gambier-Parry for the Index and Bibliography added to this work.

J. WICKHAM LEGG

OXFORD,
December 14, 1916

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	ILLUSTRATIONS	xi
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	xii
I.	INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER	1
II.	THE *ABACUS* OF THE *PRAEFECTUS PRAETORIO* AND THE MEDIAEVAL CHRISTIAN ALTAR	14
III.	THE CENSER AND LIGHTS CARRIED BEFORE THE EMPEROR, AND THE CENSER AND LIGHTS CARRIED BEFORE THE BISHOP .	19
IV.	THE GOLDEN RING OF OFFICE AND OF BISHOPS	21
V.	THE *PAENULA* AND THE COPE OR CHASUBLE	23
VI.	THE CONSULAR *VESTIS TRIUMPHALIS* AND CERTAIN EPISCOPAL ORNAMENTS . .	52
	(*a*) The *Tunica* and Alb or Surplice .	54
	(*b*) The *Toga picta* of consuls and the Σάκκος or Dalmatic of bishops	56
	(*c*) The *Pallium* or *Toga* and *Omophorion* or Pall	58
	(*d*) The *Balteus* and Girdle . .	63
	(*e*) The *Mappa* and Maniple . .	63
	(*f*) *Scipio eburneus* and the Episcopal Crosier	66
	(*g*) *Calceus patritius* and the Episcopal Buskins	71
VII.	THE *TABLION* AND *EPIGONATION* . .	74
VIII.	THE *ENCOLPION* AND THE PECTORAL CROSS OF BISHOPS	80
	INDEX	93

ILLUSTRATIONS

PLATE		*To face page*
I.	Ensigns of the *Praefectus Praetorio* from Bodleian MS. Canonici Misc. 378 .	13
II.	Group of *Praefectus Annonae* from Vatican	*between pp.* 26 *and* 27
III.	Mercury in *paenula*, from Bartolus Bartholinus	31
IV.	Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 1066	37
V.	Two Prelates at a coronation, showing the short front of the chasuble in vogue about A.D. 1000	38
VI.	Mosaic of Maximianus, Archbishop of Ravenna, and his Clerks . . .	39
VII.	Priest (? St Benignus) in alb, stole, and chasuble, baptizing St Symphorian (?) .	40
VIII.	Mosaic of Melchisedec, Abraham, Isaac and Abel	44
IX.	Much divided *paenula*, from Bartholinus .	49
X.	"*Casula*" from Martin Gerbert, semicircular The same as worn by a priest	*between pp.* 54 *and* 55
XI.	Consular diptych adapted to commemorate St Gregory the Great Consular diptych, sixth century	*between pp.* 58 *and* 59
XII.	*Tablion* worn by Justinian and his courtiers, photograph from St Vitalis at Ravenna	75

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. General Treatises

Ashdown, Mrs C. H. *British costume during xix centuries.* (Lond. 1910.)

Barbier de Montault, X. *Le costume et les usages ecclésiastiques selon la tradition romaine.* (Paris, 1897 ?)

Bloxham, M. H. *Companion to the Principles of Gothic architecture, being a brief account of the vestments in use in the church.* (Lond. 1882.)

Bock, F. *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters.* (Bonn, 1859—71.)

Boileau, Jac. *Hist. Disquisitio de Re vestiaria.* (Amst. 1704.)

Bona, Joan. *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo,* ed. Rob. Sala. (Aug. Taurin. 1747.)

Boyle, J. R. *Ecclesiastical vestments: their origin and significance.* (Lond. [1896].)

Braun, J. *Die liturgische Gewandung.* (Freiburg i. Br. 1907.)

Brown, G. B. *From Schola to Cathedral.* (Edinb. 1886.)

Le Brun, Pierre. *Explication littérale, historique et dogmatique des Prières et des Cérémonies de la Messe.* (Paris, 1777.) 4 vols.

Cabrol, F. and Leclercq, H. *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie.* (Paris, 1903.) *In progress.*

DAREMBERG, CH. and SAGLIO. *Dictionnaire des antiquités.* (Paris, 1873.) *In progress.*

DUCHESNE, L. *Origines du culte chrétien.* Various edd. (Paris, 1889 etc.) English transl., 4th ed., S.P.C.K. (Lond. 1912.)

DURANDUS, W. *Rationale divinorum officiorum.* Numerous edd. (Neapoli, 1859 etc.)

—— *The sacred vestments. An English rendering of the third book of the 'Rationale.'* By T. H. PASSMORE. (Lond. 1899.)

DURANT, J. S. *De ritibus ecclesiae Catholicae.* (Lugd. 1606.)

FORTESCUE, A. *The vestments of the Roman rite.* (Lond. 1912.)

GEORGI, D. *De Liturgia Romani Pontificis.* 3 vols. (Romae, 1731.) 'Disquisitio de sacro missae apparatu' is in first volume.

GERBERT, M. *Vetus liturgia Alemannica.* Pars I. *De vestibus sacris.* (Typ. San-Blasianis, 1776.)

GRAEVIUS, I. G. *Thesaurus antiquitatum Romanarum.* (Traj. ad Rhen. 1697.)

HEFELE, C. J. *Die liturgischen Gewänder*, in *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte.* Bd ii. (Tübingen, 1864.)

ISIDORUS, episc. Hispalensis. *De ecclesiaticis officiis.* In Migne, *Patrologia latina*, LXXXIII.

Liber Pontificalis. Ed. Duchesne. (Paris, 1886.)

MACRI, D. *Hierolexicon.* (Venetiis, 1712.)

MARINGOLA, A. *Antiquitatum Christianarum institutiones.* (Neapoli, 1857.)

MARRIOTT, W. B. *Vestiarium Christianum.* (Lond. 1868.)

—— *The vestments of the church: an illustrated lecture.* (Lond. 1869.)

MARTÈNE, E. *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus.* (Antuerp. 1736—7.)

MARTÈNE, E. and DURAND, U. *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins.* (Paris, 1717?)

MICKLETHWAITE, J. T. *The ornaments of the rubric.* (Alcuin Club, 1897.)

The Ornaments of the Church and its ministers. (Report of the Bishops. S.P.C.K. 1908.)

PUGIN, A. W. *Glossary of ecclesiastical ornament and costume.* (Lond. 1844.)

ROCCA, A. *Opera omnia.* 2 vols. (Romae, 1719.)

SAUSSAY, A. DU. *Panoplia Episcopalis.* (Paris, 1646.)

—— *Panoplia Clericalis.* (Paris, 1649.)

—— *Panoplia Sacerdotalis.* (Paris, 1653.)

SMITH, WM. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities.* 3rd ed. (Lond. 1891.)

STRABO, WALAFRID. *De rebus ecclesiasticis.* In Migne, *Patrologia latina*, CXIV. 952. (Paris, 1852.)

STRUTT, J. *A complete view of the dress and habits of the people of England.* 2 vols. (Lond. 1796.)

THALHOFER, V. *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik.* (Freiburg i. Br. 1912.)

THURSTON, H. *Catholic encyclopaedia.* (New York, 1908.)

VERT, C. DE. *Explication simple...des cérémonies de l'église.* 2nd edn. (Paris, 1706—1713.) 4 vols.

VIOLLET-LE-DUC. *Dictionnaire raisonné du mobilier français.* (Paris, 1858—75.) 6 vols.

WILPERT, J. *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten.* (Köln, 1898.)

See also *Missale Romanum* and *Pontificale Romanum.*

B. SPECIAL TREATISES OR ARTICLES

1. **Chasuble or Paenula.** BARTHOLINUS, B. In GRAEVIUS *Thesaurus, op. cit. De paenula*, tom. VI. col. 1172.

ANDERSON, W. F. C. In SMITH, WM. *Dictionary, op. cit.* vol. II. p. 309.

HEIDER, G. 'Liturgische Gewänder aus dem Stifte St. Blasien im Schwarzwalde etc.' In *Jahrbuch der k. k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung u. Erhaltung der Baudenkmale.* Bd IV. (Wien, 1860.)

LOCKHART, W. *The Chasuble, its genuine form and size.* (Lond. 1891.)

SCOTT, G. G. *An Essay on the history of English church architecture.* See p. 113. (Lond. 1881.)

2. Churches. LECLERCQ, H. and CABROL. *Dictionnaire, op. cit.* tom. II. 1re ptie, art. 'Basilique.'

LEMAIRE, R. 'L'origine de la basilique latine.' In *Annales de la soc. d'archéol. de Bruxelles.* Tom. XXV. 1911.

RUSHFORTH, G. McN. 'The Church of S. Maria Antiqua.' In *Papers of the British school at Rome.* (Lond. 1902.)

BROWN, G. B. *op. cit.*

BUNSEN, C. C. J. *Die Basiliken des christlichen Roms.* (München, 1842.)

DUCHESNE, L. *Origines, op. cit.* ch. XII.

LANCIANI, R. *Pagan and Christian Rome.* (Lond. 1892.)

3. Colours. ATCHLEY, E. G. C. F. 'On English Liturgical Colours.' In *Library of Liturgiology*, ed. by V. STALEY, 1904.

HOPE, W. H. St J. 'On the English Liturgical Colours.' In *Trans. of the St Paul's Ecclesiol. Soc.* Vol. II. (Lond. 1890.)

LEGG, J. W. *Notes on the history of liturgical colours.* (Lond. 1882.)

4. Cope. BISHOP, EDMUND. 'The origin of the Cope as a Church Vestment,' *Dublin Review*, January 1897.

CABROL and LECLERCQ. *Dictionnaire, op. cit.* tom. III. 1re ptie, col. 365.

HEIDER, G. *op. cit.* See *Chasuble.*

5. Crozier. Barrault and Martin, A. 'Le bâton pastoral, étude archéologique.' In *Mélanges d'archéologie*, tom. iv. (Paris, 1856.)

Isidorus. *op. cit.* Lib. ii. cap. v.

6. Incense. Atchley, E. G. C. F. *A history of the use of incense in divine worship.* (Alcuin Club, xiii. 1909.)

Rushforth, G. McN. In Smith, Wm, *Dictionary*, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 896.

7. Pallium or Omophorion. Bralion, N. de. *Pallium archiepiscopale.* (Paris, 1652.)

Legg, J. W. 'The blessing of the episcopal ornament called the pall.' In the *Yorkshire Archeol. Journal*, vol. xv. 1908.

Leroux, G. In Daremberg, *Dictionnaire*, *op. cit.* t. iv. 1re ptie.

Maseri, P. *De Pallio pontificio.* (Romae, 1678.)

Papebrock, D. *De forma pallii aliorumque pontificalium.* (Helmstadii, 1754.)

Vespasiani, Ph. *De sacri pallii origine.* (Romae, 1856.)

8. Rings. Deloche, M. 'Le port des Anneaux dans l'antiquité romaine.' In *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, t. xxxv. 2me ptie. (Paris, 1893.)

Isidorus. *op. cit.* Lib. ii. cap. 5, § 12.

9. Scarf. Legg, J. W. 'The black scarf of modern Church dignitaries and the grey almuce of mediaeval Canons.' In *Transactions of the St Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. iii. 1895, p. 49.

10. Stole. Thiers, J. B., *de Stolâ in Archidiaconorum visitationibus gestanda a Parœcis disceptatio.* (Paris, 1674.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

I cannot forget that during my first visit to Rome in 1877 I dared with all the impudence of youth to wait upon the illustrious Giovanni Battista de Rossi and asked his help for my studies. On that occasion, in speaking of the origin of the Christian vestments, he bade me compare the present vestments of the Greek bishop with the ornaments of the consul, and note their identity. This advice direct from the mouth of so great a master has been, or ought to have been, always with me in my attempts to deal with some of the problems of Christian antiquities.

Thus in my juvenile Notes on the Liturgical Colours, an endeavour was made to trace their relation to the colours of the garments used in every-day life in ancient Rome. White, it seemed, was a sign of festivity; a dark colour (*fuscus*) a sign of mourning; *purpureus*, and gold or green, signs of dignity[1]. These colours might be the forerunners of those that we find spoken of in early liturgical

[1] J. Wickham Legg, *Notes on the History of the Liturgical Colours*, London, 1882, p. 3: or in the *Transactions of the St Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, 1881–5, vol. I. p. 96.

writers; white, black, red, and green or yellow. They would appear to be used with the same significance in liturgy that they had in the civil or the domestic economy of ancient Rome.

There is another point that may be remembered in dealing with the matter now in hand; the alliance that Constantine created between the Church and the Empire. Under conditions, Constantine gave to the bishops the power of arbitration in certain suits; their findings were to be valid in the courts of the Empire, and it was enacted that the decrees of the Christian synods were to be upheld[1]. Honorius later on enlarges the legislation of Constantine and gives to the arbitration of a bishop an authority equal to that of the *Praefectus Praetorio* himself[2], an officer second in importance only to the emperor. It would be thus quite natural that a bishop being a high Roman official should adopt some of the ensigns of his civil duties[3].

Nor would such an adoption seem to have been frowned upon by the Church itself, when we remember that evidence is forthcoming of the retention or employment of words and practices borrowed from the

[1] Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. I. cap. ix. (Migne, *P.G.* LXVII. 883).

[2] J. Sirmond, *Appendix Codicis Theodosiani*, XVIII. Parisiis, 1631, p. 55. The law is addressed to Theodore, *Praefectus Praetorio Italiae*. I am indebted for this reference to the Rev. Dr B. J. Kidd.

[3] The practice of conferring the ensigns of the higher civil magistrates upon the priesthood was not unknown to the Romans before the Empire. The *toga praetexta* and *sella curulis* with admission to the senate were bestowed upon certain priests about the year 210 before Christ (Livy, *Hist.* XXVII. 8).

civil or the domestic economy of ancient Rome. Such words as *dioecesis* and *provincia*, used by Cicero[1], have passed into the language of the Church as *diocese* and *province*.

The clerical tonsure has been thought to be connected with the domestic practice among the Romans, which was in contrast to that of the barbarians, who wore their hair long, while civilised people cut the hair short, and shaved the beard. The Romans also wore clothes of some length, which became the clerical habit; while the Franks and other barbarians wore short garments[2].

Further it may be urged that the vessels used in the sacred mysteries of the Church must have had a domestic origin. It can hardly be doubted that the chalice and paten had their earliest models in vessels that were in common use for meals. The paten still preserves in the West the shape of an ordinary plate, such as we use to this day; and the chalice with its bowl, stem, and foot is a following of the ordinary drinking vessel of the first centuries. The early Christian ministerial chalices with the two handles, borrowed from the domestic drinking cup, suggest at once this origin[3].

[1] For *dioecesis* see Cicero, *Epist. ad Diversos*, III. viii. § 4: for *provincia* see *Or. in Verrem*, II. i. § 6. (Ed. Nobbe, *Opera*, Lipsiae, 1850, pp. 680, 248.)

[2] Claude Fleury, *Institution au droit ecclésiastique*, Partie I. Ch. v. de la tonsure; in *Opuscules*, Nismes, Beaume, 1780, t. II. p. 177. In the same sense speaks Dom C. Chardon, *Histoire des Sacremens*, Paris, 1745, t. v. ch. iii. p. 43.

[3] See the two-handled ministerial chalice in front of Melchisedec in plate VIII.

Again: whatever opinion may be held of the particular source of the church building in the early times of Roman Christianity, it seems to be agreed by those who have written on the subject that in any case the Christian church building had either a domestic or a civil origin. Two theories of the origin of the early Christian basilica hold the field. One, later in time, attributes it to a developement of the Roman house; the other, an earlier suggestion, to a close copying of the Roman court of justice.

To take first the later theory of origin. The *atrium* of the Roman house was a rectangular space around which the various rooms were arranged. At the end of the *atrium* opposite to the door was a recess or room called the *tablinum*; and of late this *tablinum* has been held to be the place in which the first Christian assemblies were held. When the faithful were few in number, they could be contained within this space; but as worshippers multiplied they overflowed into the *atrium*, leaving the *tablinum* to the clergy, which thus became a *presbyterium*[1]. This suggestion bears some resemblance to the opinion of Mr Baldwin Brown, which is that the assemblies of the Christians in the fourth century were held in the *schola*[2]. Monseigneur Duchesne has developed further the idea into the opinion that

[1] Rodolfo Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, Macmillan, 1892, p. 118. Cf. Dom H. Leclercq, *Manuel d'Archéologie chrétienne*, Paris, Letouzey, 1907, t. I. p. 369.

[2] Gerard Baldwin Brown, *From Schola to Cathedral*, Edinburgh, David Douglas, 1886.

the *atrium* was the centre of the Christian offices, around which were grouped church, bishop's house, refectory, dispensary, and infirmary[1]. The whole of this establishment grew out of the plan of the ancient Roman domestic house. I hear that this opinion of Monseigneur Duchesne is one much in favour at present with the Roman antiquaries.

Abbé Lemaire has paid considerable attention to this theory of the origin of the basilica from the old Roman house, and considers that it must be adopted to the exclusion of all other[2].

Mr G. McN. Rushforth has pointed out that such a conversion of a Roman house into a church really did take place in the case of S. Maria Antiqua at the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century[3].

But there is the older theory of a civil origin of the church building, which has still warm supporters. It is that the church is a reproduction of the basilica, the ground plan of which has a striking resemblance to that of many early Christian churches still in existence; a rectangle with an apse at one or both ends. In its first stage the basilica appears to have been an adjunct to the forum, and to have sheltered the frequenters of the forum from sun or rain. The apse may have been added for the convenience of

[1] L. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte chrétien*, ch. xii. § 1, Paris, Fontemoing, 1898, 2e éd. p. 385.

[2] R. Lemaire, *L'origine de la basilique latine*, p. 130. Extrait des *Annales de la Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles*, t. xxv. 1911.

[3] G. McN. Rushforth, *The Church of S. Maria Antiqua*, in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, London, 1902, p. 19.

judges and counsel. It is this design which has been claimed by Bunsen[1] and E. A. Freeman[2], as the source of the Christian church building. Freeman writes forcibly, perhaps too vigorously, if we consider that not so many of the legal basilicas were converted to Christian service:

> To have thus turned the basilica to Christian uses was almost a greater triumph than to have done the like by pagan temples. To destroy the temples and to consecrate the basilicas was the most speaking expression of the facts that the pagan worship had come to an end and that the Empire itself had become Christian. When the seat whence the heathen judge had handed over the martyr to the sword or to the lions became the seat from which the Bishop arose to celebrate the Christian mysteries, no more speaking embodiment could be needed of the triumphant climax, "Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat." It was a sign that the Roman Empire was beginning to deserve its later title of Holy, a sign that the Chief Pontiff of idols was passing into the Advocate of the Universal Church[3].

Thus either of these opinions makes us attribute a domestic or a civil origin to the design of the early Christian church building. Yet with Dom Henri Leclercq we may be led to suggest that the origin of the Christian basilica may not be simple, and that some parts of the building may have been drawn from one source, others from others. From the civil

[1] C. C. J. Bunsen, *Die Basiliken des christlichen Roms*, Letterpress, München, Cotta, 1842, p. 26.

[2] Edward A. Freeman, *Historical and Architectural Sketches, chiefly Italian*, Macmillan, 1876, p. 186.

[3] *ibid.* p. 188.

basilica may have been borrowed the oblong form, the colonnade of the nave, the structure of the roof; while from the *atrium* may have been drawn the idea of a hall; from the *exedrae*, opening into the place of assembly, the apse[1].

It may reasonably be held that there was no feeling in the Church at the time of Constantine, and later, against taking over things and practices that were merely parts of civil or domestic life. It was different with the use of the temples. After the Peace of the Church, when Christianity became the dominant religion, we must wait for two hundred years before we find an instance of a temple being turned into a Christian church. It was in the pontificate of Felix the Fourth (A.D. 526 to 530) that the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian was founded in the *Templum Sacrae Urbis*; and almost another hundred years passed before the consecration of the Pantheon in the early seventh century.

It should be noted that in this work we are dealing with things that were in use in civil or domestic

[1] H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Paris, Letouzey, 1910, t. II. partie 1, col. 535, sub voce *Basilique*. The consecration of the church building in the West is accompanied by a curious forming of the letter X on the floor of the church, the arms of the letter stretching from one corner of the rectangular building to the other, in which X the bishop writes the Greek and Latin alphabets with the point of his crosier. Of this G. B. de Rossi (*Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, Roma, Salviucci, Serie Terza, anno sesto, 1881, p. 140) has pointed out the resemblance to what was done by the *agrimensor* or land surveyor. But the further consideration of this ceremony would take us far beyond the bounds prescribed by the title of this work.

life, and had no religious significance. An attempt to connect a large number of Christian ceremonies with those attending the worship of idols was made at the end of the third decade of the eighteenth century, by Dr Conyers Middleton, Librarian of the University of Cambridge. He brought out *A Letter from Rome*[1], which attained a certain amount of vogue, and went through at least five editions in the eighteenth century, and was published again by Tegg as late as 1868. It cannot be thought to have proved its point, and the tract, in spite of considerable popularity as a weapon that could be used against papists, has now fallen into a deserved neglect.

At the time of the appearance of Middleton's work it was perceived not only by Roman Catholics, but also by members of the Church of England, that his theories contained in them the germs of an attack upon matters far more important than ceremonies in

[1] Conyers Middleton, *A letter from Rome, shewing an Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism: or, the Religion of the Present Romans to be derived entirely from that of their Heathen Ancestors*, London, Innys, 1729, 4°. A large Prefatory Discourse and a Postscript are added to the fourth and fifth editions of 1741 and 1742 respectively; for a reply to which see an anonymous pamphlet entitled *Friendly Advice to C[onye]rs M[iddleto]n, D.D. concerning the fourth edition of his Letter from Rome*, London, Needham, 1741. A French work, attributed to Pierre Mussard, written on the same lines as the Letter of Conyers Middleton, was published at Leyden in 1667 with the title *Les conformitez des ceremonies modernes avec les anciennes*. The destructive tendency to be noticed in Conyers Middleton is perceptible also in this work, and it may have suggested ideas to the Cambridge Librarian. It was translated into English by James du Pré, and published in London in 1732 with the title *Roma Antiqua et Recens*.

worship[1]. There is however no intention in this volume of following Dr Middleton in his deduction of Christian ceremonies from those employed in heathen rites. It is not the ceremonies but the Church ornaments which will here be compared with those seen in civil life. Some of these latter, it has been noted above, are allowed by the best historical authorities to have their sources in the administrative or the domestic economy of ancient Rome.

Leaving the idea that the Christian vestments are descendants of those used in the worship of idols, there is another theory which finds their origin in the Jewish law. In the later middle ages the school of Durandus took almost entire possession of the treatises on the Christian ornaments and ceremonies. To each little ceremony was given a meaning never present, we may well believe, to the minds of those who began the practice, and this symbolism became positively frivolous, as Laud saw[2], when he replied to one quoting the authority of Durandus against him with: "*Durand* says so. Now truly the more Fool he." And one may remember here a remark of Dom Henri Leclercq, not inapplicable to other ornaments besides buskins and sandals, that he really has not the courage to copy out what has been written on the

[1] This sceptical tendency, latent in the Letter from Rome, became plainer as time went on. Zachary Pearce, "afterwards bishop of Rochester, accused him in a 'Reply' of covert infidelity" (*Dictionary of National Biography*, under Conyers Middleton, XXXVII. 345).

[2] Henry Wharton, *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of... William Laud*, London, Chiswell, 1695, p. 116.

symbolism of liturgical shoes, for it was mere delirium[1].

Durandus held that the Christian vestments were copies of the ornaments described in Leviticus, although he owned that a good part of these were in shape different from the Christian[2]. There can be no doubt that in the later middle ages deliberate attempts were made to modify the ancient Christian vestments so as to resemble in certain details the Levitical; and even a few ceremonies now used in the Canon of the Mass were introduced at the same time, so as to give the impression that certain of the Levitical ceremonies in offering sacrifice had been retained by the Christians[3].

Pater Joseph Braun puts aside the notion that the Christian vestments were derived from the Jewish with the remark that they are exceedingly unlike each other; three only out of the numerous Christian ornaments at all resembling any of the Jewish, namely the alb, mitre, and *rationale*[4]. Of these, the *rationale* is now obsolete, having always been rare, and, like the mitre, which is now special to prelates, of very late introduction; thus the alb is the only ornament in every day use that can be brought down from Leviticus.

[1] H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne*, etc. Paris, Letouzey, 1913, t. III. partie i. col. 1253. Sub voce *Chaussure*.

[2] William Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, lib. III. cap. xix. § 5, Neapoli, Jos. Dura, 1859, p. 133.

[3] See the Introduction to J. Wickham Legg and W. H. St John Hope, *Inventories of Christchurch, Canterbury*, Westminster, Constable, 1902, p. xvi.

[4] Joseph Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Freiburg im B. Herder, 1907, p. 766.

Before leaving this subject it may be remarked that André du Saussay, a French bishop of the first half of the seventeenth century, appears to be one of the last writers of any importance who show favour to the opinion that the Levitical and Christian vestments are allied[1]. Cardinal Bona, speaking of the chief Christian vestment, the chasuble, plainly says it is the same as the *paenula*[2].

It will be observed that in no case are the early Church authors of opinion that the ornaments arose within the Church, self-generated as it were. They all favour the thought that they are borrowed from some pre-existing system, perhaps the Jewish by preference. It will be admitted, it may be by all, that there can be no more symbolism in the Christian ornaments of the present day than they had when they began to be used first in Christian worship. It will be also allowed that, if we are to have a right understanding of these Christian ornaments, we must push our investigations back to the very earliest time at which we find them beginning to exist. Cardinal Bona has a very useful warning to those who try to interpret the origin of ceremonies by the modern custom of the Church. They do wrong, he says, who explain old ceremonies by modern teaching[3].

Such a warning as this of Cardinal Bona is even more needful in dealing with Church ornaments

[1] Andreas du Saussay, *Panoplia Episcopalis*, Lutet. Parisiorum, Cramoisy, 1646, lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 370.

[2] Ioan. Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo*, ed. Rob. Sala, lib. i. cap. xxiv. § viii. Aug. Taurin. 1749, pars ii. p. 235.

[3] *ibid.* lib. i. cap. xviii. § 1 pars ii. p. 1.

than with Church ceremonies. Admirable as the work of Pater Braun on the Vestments is, yet it has this fault: that it begins the treatment of each ornament with an account of the present use to which it is put in the Church of Rome; not with the first mention or appearance of the thing in history. The mind of the student is thus unconsciously and perhaps inevitably warped in favour of the traditional explanation of its use in the Church.

What are sometimes called the distinctive ornaments of the Christian bishop are really akin to the ornaments of the higher civil servants of the Roman Empire: for example, the pall, the ring, the crosier, the chasuble and the alb, with the buskins and sandals. Early in the Church's history some of these ornaments were common to the inferior ministers of the altar; but as time passed on there was a gradual restriction of such to one order. The chasuble, once worn by all clerks, became a mark of men in holy orders. The pectoral cross was once common to men, women, and children, kings and emperors, but is now assigned to bishops and other prelates. The mitre was once worn by chanters and choristers, but is now episcopal. Buskins were worn by deacons of the Roman Church and elsewhere, but are now ensigns of the bishop or prelate.

In this particular the traditions of the Church of Rome must be disregarded. Especially must it be kept in mind that there are no such things as special Eucharistic vestments. Such a vestment as the



Ensigns of a Pretorian Prefect

(From *Notitia Dignitatum*, MS. Canonici Misc. no. 378, in the Bodleian Library)

chasuble, to which a special significance has been assigned by some writers, is to this day worn by clerks who are not priests, and out of the time of mass.

On the other hand, in the pages which follow an attempt will be made to follow the developement of certain civil ornaments into ornaments used in Christian worship. It will be noticed that the *abacus* of the *Praefectus Praetorio* with its lights and book of imperial laws is closely followed by the Christian altar with its lights and gospel book. The fire and incense carried before the emperor become the lights and incense carried before the bishop. The *paenula* and *tunica* are strikingly reproduced in the chasuble and alb, and the consular *pallium* of the diptychs of the later Empire in the Eastern omophorion and the early Western pall. The consular staff (*scipio eburneus*) and the gold ring of official life become the pastoral staff and ring of the bishop, although they be of much antiquity, for they were early delivered to him during consecration to office.

Of less importance are the *calceus patritius*, which passes into the episcopal sandal; the *encolpion* of everyday life, which ends in the pectoral cross of bishops; and the quadrangular ornament worn by the courtiers of Justinian, and by Justinian himself, over the *chlamys*, and named the *tablion*, may be reproduced in the *epigonation* of the modern Orthodox bishop or prelate.

CHAPTER II

THE *ABACUS* OF THE *PRAEFECTUS PRAETORIO* AND THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR

THERE has come down to us a certain work known to scholars by the name of *Notitia Dignitatum*, which Dr Thomas Hodgkin thinks was compiled in the first years of the fifth century; and he holds that the extant manuscripts contain drawings which are substantially accurate copies of those which adorned the *Notitia* when the leaves were turned over by Arcadius and Honorius[1]. These drawings have been reproduced in outline by two nineteenth century editors[2], and thus may be conveniently studied by those who have not access to the manuscripts. They are representations of the ensigns of the high officials of the Eastern and Western Empires. One of the very highest of these officials, usually accounted next in dignity to the Emperor

[1] Thomas Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, book I. ch. 3, Oxford, 1880, vol. I. p. 200.

[2] Edw. Böcking, *Notitia Dignitatum*, Bonnae, Marcus, 1839–53, in three volumes: Otto Seeck, *Notitia Dignitatum*, Berolini, apud Weidmannos, 1876. One of the finest of these manuscripts is that in Bodley's Library, MS. Canonici Misc. 378.

himself, was the *Praefectus Praetorio*[1], and his ensigns are depicted in the representations which accompany the manuscripts, of which Dr Hodgkin's opinion has just been quoted. Some few of these are common to the *Praefectus Praetorio* and other high officials; and a short account may now be given of those more frequently seen.

One of these ensigns that is common to many of these officials is the *pila*, on which the images of the Caesars are painted; and there is also a book, *lex mandatorum*, which is placed upon an *abacus* seen in some, but not in all, of the drawings of the ensigns of the officers: but the *Praefectus Praetorio* had other ensigns as well; the *sella curulis*, now placed in a chariot drawn by four white horses, and four lighted candles set on the *abacus* with the *lex mandatorum*, in the middle of the *abacus*, between the candles[2]. The *abacus* itself, whether as ensign of the higher or lower officers, has four feet, and is covered with some textile fabric, which in the Canonici manuscript shows always a shade of blue[3].

It will be owned that this last of the ensigns has a striking resemblance to a mediaeval Christian altar. The length of the *abacus* is greater than its breadth. It is covered with a cloth, which from the dignity of

[1] "Illustre [*sic*] huius magistratus, soli sceptro cedentis" (Ioan. Laur. Lydus, *de Magistratibus*, lib. II. cap. v. Lugd. Batav. Luchtmans, 1812, p. 101).

[2] See plate I.

[3] The ensigns that are special to the two higher dignitaries may be seen in the Bodleian Library, MS. Canonici Misc. 378, ff. 90 and 131 b; Boecking, I. 12, II. 8*; Seeck, p. 8.

the magistrate whose ensign it adorns may well be of silk or linen. It bears four lighted candles, and between these, in the midst, the *liber mandatorum* is set, even as the book of the gospels (*liber mandatorum Dei*) was placed in so many mediaeval altars. An early Christian altar of the seventh century has been found at Saint Marcel de Crussal (Ardèche)[1], which bears in shape and proportion a great resemblance to the four-footed *abacus* of the *Praefectus Praetorio*. It is a hard matter to resist the opinion that a mediaeval altar in respect of its proportions, its coverings, its lights, and its book of the gospels, owes something in some way to this ensign of the high official of the Roman Empire.

In the Holy Orthodox Church it has long been the custom to set the book of the gospels on the Holy Table, and Dr Brightman notes the custom as still preserved[2]. In the West the custom has gone out of use. The loss of the practice is regretted

[1] *Revue archéologique*, Paris, 1903, vol. II. pp. 294–5, fig. 30. See also below, plate VIII, the table before which Melchisedec stands, offering bread and wine.

[2] F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896, vol. I. p. 577. Cf. John Glen King, *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, London, W. Owen, etc. 1772, p. 26, "Upon the holy table the cross is always laid, and the gospel." See the representations of the Holy Table with the Gospel book standing on the north side and the cross laid flat on the south. (Michael Rajewsky, *Euchologion der Orthodox-katholischen Kirche*, Wien, 1861, Th. I. S. viii. Cf. Dimitrij Sokolow, *Darstellung des Gottesdienstes der orthodox-katholischen Kirche des Morgenlandes*, Berlin, Siegismund, 1893, p. 7, translated from the Russian by Georgij Morosow, priest of the Imperial Russian chapel at Stuttgart.)

by such a writer as Dr Adrian Fortescue. Noting that "enormous reverence was always shown to the book of the Gospels" in every part of Christendom, he adds:

> More than a statue or a cross the book that contains his words may stand as a symbol of his presence[1].

In England before the Reformation there is the well-known instance of the book of the Gospels at Durham[2]. The late Mr J. T. Micklethwaite thought that the gospel book on the altar was usual in collegiate churches before 1548, but not in parish churches[3]. In the seventeenth century in England a practice like that just named was not unknown. At Canterbury a Bible containing the whole of the canonical and deutero-canonical scriptures was kept on the altar[4]. At Winchester two books, handsomely bound, given by King Charles the Second, still remain on the altar; they are a Prayer Book and Bible. At Christ Church, Oxford, there were, until quite lately, two similar volumes on the altar, given by one of the Canons before the rebellion; but now kept above the credence-table; and at St George's Chapel, Windsor, there used to be, within my own recollection, two folio volumes containing

[1] Adrian Fortescue, *The Mass*, London, Longmans, 1912, ch. vi. pp. 283, 284.

[2] J. T. Fowler, *Rites of Durham*, Surtees Society, 1903, vol. CVII. p. 73.

[3] J. T. Micklethwaite, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, Alcuin Club, 1897, p. 32.

[4] J. Wickham Legg and W. H. St John Hope, *Inventories of Christchurch Canterbury*, Westminster, Constables, 1902, pp. 278 and 283.

the Bible, on the altar, leaning against the wall. I am informed that it was the same at the Chapels Royal, Whitehall, and St James', until 1884[1].

There may be other churches in this land, where the hand of the restorer has not been too active, that may show yet the ancient custom of honouring the book of the gospels by placing it in the most sacred portion of the church.

Much to his credit, Mr Micklethwaite tried to introduce this seventeenth century practice into churches which he was asked to design. He was unable to set a gospel book only on the altar because the modern printers did not keep such in stock: a strange thing, he added, in a Christian land.

[1] For much assistance in supplying details in this matter which had escaped my memory or which I had never known, I am indebted to the Venerable Dr Fearon, Archdeacon of Winchester; the Rev. John Vaughan, Canon of the same church; the Rev. Dr Cooke, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; the Rev. J. N. Dalton, Canon of Windsor; and the Rev. Dr Edgar Sheppard, Sub-dean of the Chapels Royal.

CHAPTER III

THE CENSER AND LIGHTS CARRIED BEFORE THE EMPEROR AND THE CENSER AND LIGHTS CARRIED BEFORE THE BISHOP

The censer and lights, whether candles or lamps, have been used in Christian worship, it will be allowed, for many years. Mr Cuthbert Atchley has made a deep and thorough investigation into the history of the use of these two ornaments in prae-Christian and in Christian times. In Horace he finds a man of much pretention, who showed self-importance by having carried before him a pan of live coals. Further, he notes, in many cases among imperial ensigns in the time of Commodus, and later, the use of this "Fire," which may possibly be both incense and lights[1].

Mr Atchley draws the conclusion that "the Fire" was composed of (1) a censer with burning incense, and (2) lights, either lamps, candles, or torches.

On the day of his triumph, incense was burnt before the chariot of the victorious general[2]. But Mr Atchley does not consider it certain that it

[1] E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, *A history of the use of incense in divine Worship*, Alcuin Club Collections, XIII. 1909, pp. 50–57.

[2] G. McN. Rushforth, in Wm Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 3rd ed. Murray, 1891, vol. II. p. 896.

was carried in the procession, as some authors of the period of the Renascence assert: though he considers this "eminently probable" in view of the developement of the practice both with incense and lights[1].

Further, before lights and incense had acquired any ecclesiastical sense, they were employed by Christians to show joy, and to acclaim and welcome returning travellers. Thus when St Athanasius came back in A.D. 346, illuminations and incense[2] were exhibited; and at the deposition of Nestorius in A.D. 431, the men came to meet St Cyril with lamps, the women with censers[3].

In *Ordo Romanus Primus*, the first written account that we have of the ceremonial of the Roman Church, the censer and the portable candlesticks are in use much in the same manner as incense and lamps were in use in the Emperor's court. Incense and lights are borne before the Pontiff in procession on his way to the altar[4].

The further developement in the Church of the use of incense and lights need not here be entered upon.

[1] E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, *op. cit.* p. 49.

[2] So Dr William Bright (*Age of the Fathers*, ch. xi., Longmans, 1903, vol. I. p. 200) seems to understand Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* XXI. § 29. (Migne, *P.G.* XXXV. 1117.)

[3] Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistola*, XXIV. (Migne, *P.G.* LXXVII. 137.)

[4] *Ordo Romanus Primus*, § 8, ed. Mabillon, *Musei Italici* lib. II. Lut. Parisior. 1724, p. 8.

CHAPTER IV

THE OFFICIAL GOLDEN RING AND THE EPISCOPAL RING

THE golden ring was among the Romans an honourable distinction. It was a mark of equestrian rank, as we may all remember from the bushel, or so, of golden rings taken to Carthage by the victors after the battle of Cannae[1]. Later on, the golden ring became an ensign of the chief civil magistrates, such as senators and ambassadors[2]. It has been said above that at the Peace of the Church the bishop became an official of the Empire[3]. Thus seeing how widespread the golden ring was as a mark of official rank, it was only to be looked for that it should early become an ensign of episcopal dignity. If we neglect the instances in which a ring has been found in the tombs of bishops, as proving little or nothing, the episcopal ring is spoken of by St Isidore of Seville, who became bishop of that see in A.D. 600. He says

[1] Livy, *Hist.* XXIII. 12.

[2] See Monsieur M. Deloche's paper *Le Port des Anneaux dans l'Antiquité Romaine*, printed by the Institute of France, in its *Mémoires* (*Académie des Inscriptions*), 1893, t. XXXV. partie ii. p. 175.

[3] See above, p. 2.

that when a bishop is consecrated there is given to the elect a staff and also a ring[1].

Isidore applies to the ring the words *signum pontificalis honoris*, which show that he accounted it in one way a mark of dignity; it was borrowed from the civil customs of the Roman world around, without any symbolism at that time being added beyond that suggestion. In fact, the episcopal ring seems to have suffered less from the dreams of the mediaeval ritualists than other of the episcopal ornaments[2].

[1] Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. II. cap. 5, § 12. (Migne, *P.L.* LXXXIII. 783.)

[2] Joseph Catalani, *Pontificale Romanum*, tit. XIII. § xxix. comment. sect. iii. Paris, Leroux and Jouby, 1850, t. I. p. 346.

CHAPTER V

THE PAENULA, COPE, AND CHASUBLE

THE chasuble or *paenula* has had a most varied fortune. Sometimes it is found in ceremonial use amongst tribes that have barely ceased to be savages[1]; at other times in its history it appears as the dress of senators and consuls, and of the highest rank of ecclesiastics. As it was originally of the simplest form, a circular or oblong piece of cloth, with a hole in the centre to allow the passage of the head, and large enough to cover the whole body, it must have been very early known to man even in the state of barbarism. It was, and is still in some parts of the world, merely a protection against cold, wind, rain, or snow. It may be well to quote the opinion of an authoritative writer on the *paenula* from Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionary of Greek*

[1] It should be observed that a barbarous tribe of Indians on the north-west coast of Southern Alaska and Northern British Columbia wear as ceremonial dress a blanket shaped like the early chasuble. It is described as of "the form of a truncated cone, with no openings for the arms." (Albert P. Niblack, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution...for the year ending June* 30, 1888, Report of the U.S. National Museum, Washington, 1890, p. 273. This volume is not to be mistaken for a similar issue with *To July* 1888 on the title.)

and Roman Antiquities; Monsieur Leroux adopts the usual view that in early Rome the *paenula* was the dress of slaves, countrymen, soldiers, and women[1]; it was made of leather, or wool, or frieze, for protection in bad weather. But he notes the two varieties of the *paenula*, one which is open in front, and the other, the more usual, he thinks, closed in front[1]. This point will need to be borne in mind when we come to discuss the varieties of the *paenula* in use after it has become a Christian vestment, the chasuble.

It has just been said that the *paenula* first appears at Rome as the garment of the working classes, of slaves and peasants. But as time goes on its fortunes improve; Cicero speaks of it as if in his day it were already the dress of the gentlefolk. People who come to dine with him wear the *paenula* or chasuble[2]. The *paenula* must have been a garment worn by persons entitled to respect in the first half of the fourth century; for St Augustine speaks of his teachers in his youth as *paenulati magistri*[3]. A step higher may be noticed in the Theodosian Codex, when senators are not allowed to wear military dress within the walls of the city, but

[1] G. Leroux, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, Paris, Hachette, no date, t. IV. première partie, sub voce *pallium*, p. 291.

[2] Cicero, *ad Atticum*, XIII. 33, § 4. De Varrone loquebamur: lupus in fabula. Venit enim ad me, et quidem id temporis, ut retinendus esset. Sed ego ita egi, ut non scinderem penulam. (Ed. Nobbe, Lips. 1850, p. 926.)

[3] St Augustine, *Confess.* lib. I. cap. XVI. (Migne, *P.L.* XXXII. 672.)

are to appear in the peaceful garments of alb and chasuble[1]. There may be noticed here the combination of the alb (*colobus* or *tunica*) with the chasuble, which is to last for centuries.

The following is a free version of the Theodosian edict:

At all hours, morning included, no senator, while within the walls of the city [sc. Rome or Constantinople], is to adopt the military uniform: but, putting aside the martial cloak, with its alarming look, he is to wear the peaceful garb of *alb* and *chasuble*.... Members of his retinue we command to use the chasuble, but to have their [alb or] undergarment girded: provided, however, that they cover the breast with a [scarf, plaid or] pall of divers colours, and so show, by this means of recognition, what is proper to men in their rank of life. Slaves, of course, of anyone (provided that their master is not under obligation of military service [*i.e.* an officer in the army]) we permit to adopt russet cloaks or hoods.

This translation has been given me by the Rev. Dr B. J. Kidd, who adds the following observations:

This law was in view of the popularity of barbarian fashions—probably Gothic: for which compare Maximus the Cynic who curled his hair and dyed it yellow to look like a Goth and by this means nearly supplanted St Gregory Nazianzen in the favour of the ladies of his congregation at Constantinople. "Gregory," they said,

[1] Sed chlamydis terrore deposito quieta coloborum ac paenularum induat vestimenta. (*Libri Theodosian.* lib. XIV. cap. x. 1, Berol. 1905, ed. Mommsen, p. 789.) Dr Brightman says distinctly that the decree "required senators to wear what we should call an alb and a chasuble." (*Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1901, p. 391.)

"is a good preacher: but Maximus has such darling curls"—yellow and black[1].

In the West, it was not Gothic but German fashions that were the rage.

Three edicts of Honorius between 397 and 416 forbid the wearing of trousers, long hair, and fur coats of the barbarian style within the precincts of the City[2].

With the sixth century writers, the *paenula* or chasuble is spoken of as attaining a great pitch of dignity. It has become an ensign of the consul himself[3]. G. B. de Rossi has published a drawing in which no less a person than the *Praefectus Annonae* is represented in alb and chasuble[4]. The drawing, here reproduced[5], shows a group of which the *Praefectus Annonae* and his wife are the most important figures. She stands in the middle; it may be the son on the prefect's right; the daughter on the left of the lady. Alb and chasuble (*tunica*

[1] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmen* XI. de Vita sua, 751–72. (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, XXXVII. 1082.)

[2] Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire*, 2nd ed. Macmillan, 1899, bk IV. ch. i. p. 297.

[3] Ioan. Laur. Lydus, *de Magistratibus Reipublicae Romanae*, I. 32, ed. Fuss, Lugd. Batav. Luchtmans, 1812, p. 55. Consulum insignia toga alba, talaris, et colobus, paenula aliquanto restrictior, laticlavius, purpura, etc. Primasius, Bishop of Adrumetum, otherwise Justinianopolis, in the sixth century, writes: Penula vestis erat consularis antiquorum Romanorum. (In *Ep.* II. *ad Timoth.* IV. 13, Migne, *P.L.* LXVIII. 679.)

[4] G. B. de Rossi, *Annali dell' Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica*, 1885, vol. LVII. p. 223, tav. d' agg. I. See specially p. 230.

[5] See Plate II. It is called the *paenula nobilis*. The drawing has been photographed for this work by Signor Pompeo Sansaini, at the Vatican.

Praefectus Annonae

(From MS. Vaticanus 9136, fo. 217, from a photo

Paenula and Tunica

ph taken for this work by Signor Pompeo Sansaini)

and *paenula*) are worn by the two men. In front the *paenulae* are divided in two by a seam from the neck to the bottom of the garment, and are also cut away at the lower end of the seam, though not to so great an extent as in the *paenula* of the Mercury reproduced below from Bartolus Bartholinus[1]. The lady has a *mappa* in her left hand; her right is on the shoulder of the prefect[2].

Pope Celestine the First (A.D. 423–432), just at the moment when the ordinary dress of the civil magistrate is becoming the fixed liturgical costume, addresses some cogent remarks to the Gaulish bishops, telling the clergy that they were to dress, not in an ascetic fashion, but just as the rest of mankind at the time did[3]; the upper classes, we have seen, wore alb and chasuble.

Bearing upon this there is the tradition recorded by Walafrid Strabo, who died in 859, that in the first centuries the Christian mysteries were celebrated by priests wearing their usual clothes, *commune indumentum*; these may have been like our Sunday clothes, only to be distinguished from ordinary wear by a greater freshness or richness[4].

The *commune indumentum* of Walafrid Strabo was doubtless the *tunica* and *paenula*; or in other words, the alb and chasuble.

[1] See Plate III. [2] Plate II.

[3] Celestine, *Epist. iv.* cap. i. § 2. (Migne, *P.L.* L. 431.) "Discernendi a plebe vel caeteris sumus doctrina, non veste; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu."

[4] Walafrid Strabo, *De rebus ecclesiasticis*, cap. 24. (Migne, *P.L.* CXIV. 952.)

Upon Celestine's letter Dr B. J. Kidd allows me to print a note taken from his lectures on ecclesiastical history:

Celestine's reproof is interesting. It shows on the unimpeachable evidence of a Pope, that while as yet in the West there was no specifically liturgical dress for the clergy in church, nevertheless they wore chasuble and alb for Sunday clothes as would other gentlemen in their congregation. A couple of hundred years later, gentlemen in the congregation would have been found wearing the tunic and breeches of their barbarian conquerors; and only the clergy retained the flowing attire of the Roman gentleman, which by this time was becoming specifically liturgical, though not even to-day specifically sacerdotal, nor specifically eucharistic, but traditional and seemly. (Cf. C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches on Ecclesiastical History*, Longmans, 1906, p. 228, note 1.)

Some antiquaries have thought that the toga was the forerunner of the chasuble as a church vestment. But this view is rejected by Rohault de Fleury and Dr Adrian Fortescue, on the grounds that the toga was the dress of the great, the rich, and the noble, while the Church adopted the *paenula*, because it was the dress of the poor and humble. But we have seen how great a change had taken place in the fortunes of the *paenula* by the fifth century; and Monsieur Courby is further of opinion that the toga itself was sometimes the dress of the humble, and even of the vicious; it was not always a sign that the wearer was one of the aristocrats of Rome[1]. So

[1] Courby, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, Paris, Hachette, 1913, fasc. XLVIII. sub voce *Toga*, p. 348.

that the opinion that the toga was rejected because it was the dress of the upper classes seems based on uncertain facts, and the argument is therefore unconvincing. Still it is argued by Rohault de Fleury that the toga was the privilege of the great and ostentatious, while Christianity was taken up by the poor and humble, and the true Christian sympathies were discovered when the dress of the slave, the *paenula*, became the Christian vestment above all others[1].

Dr Adrian Fortescue follows much in the same strain :

> The toga could be worn only by Roman citizens, and most Christians were not Roman citizens. It was an aristocratic garment, a symbol of national pride. It did not suit the people who stood for a universal Church which gave equal rights to slaves, freedmen, barbarians[2].

But this is a somewhat sentimental way of writing the history of liturgical vestments. Yet more : it is to make the history of the chasuble unlike that of other ornaments. These were not borrowed from the mean and abject of the populace, but from the dignified and high placed civil servants of the Empire. It may be believed that the Fathers of the age in which special vestments began to be worn would have been shocked at the use of common and shabby garments in the divine worship, even as we have seen above that

[1] Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1888, vol. VII. p. 112.

[2] Adrian Fortescue, *The Vestments of the Roman Rite*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1914, p. 6.

Pope Celestine the First was shocked at the use of some unkempt imitations of the clothing of St John the Baptist.

It may also be noticed that it is not quite settled among the Roman antiquaries what the precise shape of the toga was. Some think that it was an ellipse; others that in its earliest shape it was rectangular, while others maintain that if it were rectangular at first, yet later it became semicircular[1]. Until we know more accurately what the shape of the toga was, we can hardly discuss profitably its influence on the Christian vestments.

From the representations that have come down to us as well as from the writings of authors that have been mentioned above, it may be gathered that there were two shapes of the *paenula* in ancient Rome: one, which was undivided, following the simple idea of a round or oval blanket with a mere hole in the centre to allow the head of the wearer to pass through; and another, which was indeed much the same as the former, the only difference being that it was divided in front for the convenience of putting on. By this division the thrusting of the head in a somewhat uncertain direction, and the possible disarrangement of the hair, were avoided. It could be put on like a modern cloak or an old-fashioned eighteenth century surplice.

Cicero perhaps speaks of this latter shape of the *paenula* when he tells Atticus that one Varro came to see him, expecting to be asked to stay and dine.

[1] See Courby, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *loc. cit.*

Mercury in Divided Paenula with hood

(From J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*, Traject. ad Rhen. Halma, 1697, t. vi. col. 1172)

Cicero says: "Sed ita egi ut non scinderem penulam[1]." Some scholars think that this expression means that Cicero did not make a show of undoing the *paenula* of the unbidden guest; just as we do not invite a bore when he comes to see us to take off his great coat. This view has the support of Marquardt[2]. The Dublin editors, however, translate "scinderem paenulam" by "I did not quite tear his cloak[3]."

This divided *paenula* is recognised almost as soon as the history of the *paenula* begins to be studied at the end of the seventeenth century. Bartolus Bartholinus, in his tract *de paenula*, gives a drawing of a Mercury clad in a *paenula* which has plainly a seam up the middle front of the garment[4]. Mercury, as a messenger, appears equipped for all weathers, and thus wears the *paenula*. This *paenula* is divided, showing a distinct join down from the neck to the edge of the garment. At the end of the seam the stuff has been cut away so as to leave a triangular space, like that presented by a modern waistcoat[5]. The division is so very often seen that by some writers it has been assumed to be the

[1] Cicero, *Epistolae ad Atticum*, XIII. 33, § 4 (ed. Nobbe, Lipsiae, Tauchnitz, 1850, p. 926).

[2] Joachim Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, 2e Auflage, Leipzig, Hirzel, 1886, p. 565.

[3] Tyrrell and Purser, *Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, Dublin, University Press, 1897, vol. v. p. 126. See also Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, Berlin, Calvary, 1882, Theil III. p. 216.

[4] Bartolus Bartholinus, *de paenula*, cap. IV. in I. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*, Traj. ad Rhen. Halma, 1697, t. VI. col. 1172.

[5] Plate III.

usual thing. By a writer in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* it is said:

> In most cases a tuckered seam runs down the centre in front[1].

And Monsieur Viollet-le-Duc has reproduced this figure of Mercury in a *paenula* as an illustration of the word *cape*[2]; which drawing has again been borrowed by Dom Henri Leclercq for an article on the word *Chape*[3]. Thus it may be noticed that the ancient divided *paenula* has come to be recognised by French archaeologists as bearing some relation to the cope. The cope and chasuble do touch each other at many points, and it is hardly safe to assert that they have nothing common in origin or in use.

The exigencies of controversy have sometimes made necessary a stout denial that any common origin can be possible for the cope and the chasuble. It is asserted that the chasuble is strictly limited to the priesthood, while the cope may be worn by anyone. Such opinions may be favoured by the writers of the later middle ages and of the period when the Reformation had begun; but it must occur to almost everyone who has made a study of the outermost

[1] W. C. F. Anderson, in Wm Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 3rd edition, Murray, 1891, sub voce *Paenula*, vol. II. p. 309.

[2] Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné du Mobilier français*, Paris, Morel, 1872, t. III. p. 91.

[3] Fernand Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris, Letouzey, 1911, t. III. première partie, col. 365.

silken vestments of the early middle ages that there is a strong likelihood that the chasuble together with the cope are both derived from the *paenula*; one from the closed *paenula*, the other from the divided *paenula*.

If I understand Pater Braun well, he considers that from the time of Charles the Great the cope was, judged by the drawings that have come down to us, a kind of chasuble, undivided from its lower to its upper border, but provided with a hood, which however is not so unusual before the ninth century as attached to the chasuble. In fact St Isidore of Seville defines the chasuble as *vestis cucullata*[1]. But in the eleventh century the cope is divided in front, and this remains the type of that vestment for the remainder of the Christian centuries[2].

It may be asked, is it absolutely necessary to resort to the theory that in the two centuries from the ninth to the eleventh the cope and the chasuble were almost identical? that the undivided vestment was that most widely known? Taking it, as we know from the history of the *paenula*, that the use of the divided and the undivided *paenula* was widely spread before they passed into the service of the Church, does it not seem likely that both together became liturgical vestments nearly at the same

[1] Isidore, *Etymologiarum* lib. XIX. cap. XXIV. (Migne, *P.L.* LXXXII. 691.)

[2] Joseph Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Freiburg im B. Herder, 1907, p. 317.

time? In this way there would be a continuity in the use of the two shapes of the vestment; and no need to invoke a new departure in the eleventh century by the slitting up of the chasuble, but only to suggest a reasonable theory of a survival from the earlier centuries of the divided *paenula*.

Pater Braun himself laments the paucity of the information given by the early pre-millennial ritualists touching the chasuble. He says they have left us quite in the dark about the shape of the chasuble (*Planeta*), and it is only in the tenth century that we begin to have exact information as to the shape of this vestment[1].

If we really know so little of the shape of the chasuble in these early ages, can we be justified in building an hypothesis upon this imperfect information? So late as the twelfth or thirteenth centuries it may also be noticed that in some parts of the West, as in the Black Forest, there does not seem to be much distinction between the shape of the chasuble and the shape of the cope. It is hardly to be supposed that Dom Martin Gerbert, Abbot of St Blaise, did not know the difference in shape between a chasuble and a cope. Yet in speaking of three ancient vestments preserved in his Abbey, of very considerable interest, he calls one, a cope, and the other two, chasubles; yet in shape they do not differ from each other; only one of the chasubles

[1] Joseph Braun, *op. cit.* p. 174.

has a stole and maniple, and is therefore, it would be presumed, a chasuble[1].

In a note Gerbert gives a long description of the subjects of the embroidery of the three vestments, by means of which it is quite possible to identify them with the three vestments described in 1860, at great length, by Dr Gustav Heider[2], who claims, as he has every right to claim, that they are the same as those which Gerbert speaks of in the eighteenth century.

Neither Dom Martin Gerbert nor Dr Heider says much about the shape of the vestments described. But they do more; they give drawings of the vestments when laid out on a flat surface. In both writers three are drawn of the same shape, a semicircle; and yet, it has just been said, two are called chasubles (*Casula*) and one a cope (*Pluviale*). At the right-hand lower corner of the engraving of this semicircular chasuble, there is also an engraving of a priest vested in this chasuble[3]. This drawing bears a great resemblance to the appearance of a chasuble now preserved at Hildesheim, and exhibited on a frame or shape, which has a mitre on its head.

[1] Martin Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, typ. San-Blasianis, 1786. Pars prima, de vestibus sacris, c. iii. p. 265.

[2] Gustav Heider, *Liturgische Gewänder aus dem Stifte St. Blasien im Schwarzwalde, dermalen aufbewahrt im Stifte St. Paul in Kärnten*, Wien, 1860. Besonderer Abdruck: aus dem IV. Bande des Jahrbuches der K. K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale.

[3] Martin Gerbert, *op. cit.* pars tertia, tabula VI. n. 1. See plate X for a reproduction of this chasuble and the vested clerk.

But in this latter vestment it cannot be well made out that a seam runs down the front part, while in Gerbert's engraving there is a seam easy to be noticed.

Had the existence of these vestments from the Black Forest been known, they might have been a useful support to the opinion set forth by the late Mr G. G. Scott, Junior: to wit, that "the true conception of the chasuble is that of a semi-circular piece of some woven material, folded in two, so as to form a quadrant[1]." At the present moment it does not seem to be proved that the semicircle is exclusively the source of the shape of the chasuble, which had two or more definite forms when it passed into the Church as a Christian vestment, and which were retained in the thousand years that followed.

Supporting this view is the fact that these cope-shaped chasubles from the Black Forest have for part of their embroidery representations of chasubles as worn by bishops and other ecclesiastics of an ordinary mediaeval shape, somewhat short perhaps, as the fore part in several cases reaches only to the middle of the thigh[2]. It does not seem a very rash inference if we hold that during the very time at which these cope-shaped chasubles were being embroidered there were at least two shapes of chasubles known in the West: one a shape, approaching to the circular, or

[1] G. G. Scott, *An essay on the history of English Church Architecture*, London, Simpkin, 1881, p. 113. Discursus on the history of the chasuble.

[2] See G. Herder, *op. cit.* Taf. III. B, Taf. IV., Taf. V. B, Taf. VIII., Taf. X. C and D.

Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 1066, to show a very short fronted chasuble

(From the Bayeux tapestry)

oval; and the other of semicircular shape, which when it was worn at the altar had to be fastened up the front, while the sides were drawn up to the shoulders by means of cords or similar contrivances, so as to allow free action of the hands and arms, as Dr Brightman says is the case to-day with the Greek chasuble[1].

That such circular chasubles existed in the West we have the evidence of Dom Edmund Martène, whose testimony cannot be refused. When he was at Pontigny, he saw the chasuble of St Edmund of Canterbury which he describes as "toute ronde par le bas comme les anciennes chasubles"; and at the abbey of St Ursin at Bourges he speaks of the chasuble and cope of Leo the third the Saint, first bishop of Bourges; of the chasuble he says: "et toute ronde, comme le sont toutes les anciennes chasubles[2]." But it is dangerous to affirm that all ancient chasubles were circular in shape. Many no doubt were; but it is well to notice that the chasuble indeed undergoes more than one or two variations in shape before the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. That which appears oftenest before A.D. 1000 is nearest akin to that seen in the mosaic of Maximianus in the church of St Vitalis at Ravenna[3]. A second variety is seen towards the end of the first

[1] See below, pp. 47–8.

[2] [Edm. Martène et Ursin Durand,] *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins*, Paris, 1717, partie ii. p. 58, partie ii. p. 112. The reader may be reminded that there are three several paginations in these two volumes.

[3] See plate VI.

millennium, and this kind reaches almost to the ground behind, while in front it is short and pointed, hardly attaining the level of the last piece of the breast-bone; such we may see in the chasuble of Stigand[1] in the Bayeux tapestry. A third variety may be produced by the sewing together of the front of the semicircular shaped chasuble, which some may call a cope, and which appears to have been in use in Germany in the middle ages. It is likely enough that other varieties may yet be brought forward; but no age or country can claim a shape prevailing over all others. In England it is true that the shape most commonly seen in the brasses up to the Reformation appears to have been that most usual from the twelfth century to the late middle ages[2].

After paying some attention to the shapes which the chasuble assumed at different periods from A.D. 600, it does not appear to me that antiquaries have yet exhaustive knowledge of the various forms assumed by the vestment during the centuries up to the Renaissance. The shape which it assumes when first adopted in Christian worship is that seen in the

[1] See plate IV.

[2] For illustrations of the early short fronted chasubles, see the drawing of the Coronation of a King, plate V, in S. R. Gardiner, *Student's History of England*, London, Longmans, 1890, vol. I. p. 99 (date 1066). For another variety see the chasuble of Stigand, plate IV., or Joseph Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Koeln, Bachem, 1898, fig. 26. For the mediaeval chasuble the same volume of Gardiner, p. 292 (date about 1400). For representations that have not, I think, been edited of the short fronted chasuble, see the British Museum manuscripts: Royal 1. D, X. fo. 21 *b*; Nero C, IV. fo. 34. They are most likely of the twelfth century.



Two Prelates at a coronation, showing the short front of the chasuble in vogue about A.D. 1000

(From S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's History of England*, London, 1890, vol. i. p. 99, by the kind permission of Messrs Longmans)

Archbishop Maximianus and his clerks

(Reproduction of a mosaic in the Church of St Vitalis at Ravenna, after a photograph taken by Signor P. Poppi of Bologna)

mosaics of Ravenna[1], and in many of the early mosaics of the churches in Rome. After the tenth century the changes which it undergoes are manifold, and have yet to be classified.

When the *paenula* passed into the service of the Christian Church and was taken over as a liturgical vestment, it did not become at once exclusively sacerdotal or eucharistic. In *Ordo Romanus Primus*, it is still worn by the acolytes of the pontifical procession[2]; and even at the present moment it is worn on certain fasting days by the deacon and subdeacon at mass, with the name of *planeta plicata*[3]. Thus its use is not confined to priests, or bishops, even to this day.

Amalarius (who for purposes of date may be taken as a single person, or two, one contemporaneous with the other, at the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century) speaks of the chasuble as "generale indumentum sacrorum ducum[4]." In *Ordo Romanus VI.* which is much later than Amalarius, the *fratres* still wear chasubles over their albs and amices, *apud quosdam*; the incense bearers also wear chasubles[5]. Monsieur Ch. Rohault has reproduced from a manu-

[1] See plate VI. of Maximianus in chasuble at St Vitalis in Ravenna.

[2] *Ordo Romanus Primus*, § 5, ed. Mabillon, *Musei Italici* t. II. Lutet. Parisiorum, 1724, p. 6.

[3] *Missale Romanum*, Rubricae generales, XIX. 6 (Desclée, 1911, p. xxix).

[4] Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. II. cap. xix. in M. Hittorp, *De divinis*, Paris, 1610, col. 389.

[5] *Ordo Romanus VI.* in Mabillon, *op. cit.*, p. 70, § 1.

script of the tenth century in the library at St Omer a representation of baptism being administered by a priest in chasuble, stole, and alb[1]. Thus so late as the tenth century the chasuble had not been restricted to the Eucharist. And again there is in the British Museum a picture of St Michael in an Anglo-Saxon Cotton MS.[2], of the first half of the eleventh century, wearing one of the short-fronted chasubles, with stole and alb or dalmatic. It is not suggested, it may be presumed, that St Michael ever celebrated the Eucharist.

To pass over the large number of instances that might be quoted from early mediaeval times down to the sixteenth century, in which the chasuble has been worn out of mass or by others than the celebrant, there may be pointed out a collection of such instances brought together by Monseigneur Barbier de Montault from the practice of modern times[3]. The first instance that he quotes is taken from the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum.* It is the occasion of a great festival and the bishop himself is to sing vespers, and his canons attend him. They are vested in copes, those that have dignities; priests in chasubles; deacons in dalmatics and subdeacons in tunicles[4].

[1] Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1888, t. VII. pl. DLXX. See p. 133. It is reproduced in this work as plate VII.

[2] Vitellius C. III. fo. 11 *b*.

[3] X. Barbier de Montault, *Le Costume et les Usages ecclésiastiques selon la tradition romaine*, Paris, Letouzey, no date [?1897], t. II. p. 82.

[4] *Caeremoniale Episcoporum Clementis VIII.* etc. Colon. Agripp. Demen, 1688, lib. I. cap. XV. p. 79.

Priest (? St Benignus) in alb, stole, and chasuble, baptizing St Symphorian (?)

(Reproduced from Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1888, t. vii. pl. DLXX. by permission of Monsieur Eggimann. Manuscript of tenth century)

Here we have vespers, not mass; and at it priests wear chasubles.

But a more striking instance follows. Supposing a canon not to have been ordained priest, he may even then wear a chasuble: and this is according to a ruling of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. It is quoted by Monseigneur Barbier de Montault in full; and his comment on the passage is that if a canon be not a priest he may wear the chasuble, it being regarded as an ensign of his office[1].

A canon is thus allowed to wear the chasuble, perhaps if not yet in holy orders. After this the instances in which canons wear chasubles at the procession on Palm Sunday, or priests at the blessing of the oils in Cena Domini, or regulars in solemn processions, need not now be considered.

And in Russia we are taught that there is a shortened form of the chasuble, still worn by readers, chanters, and acolytes: it is the first of the clerical vestments, just as in the West the surplice is the foundation-ornament of the clerical order. This shortened chasuble merely marks the introduction to orders, while the large full chasuble reaching to the feet signifies the perfection of the priesthood[2].

How little doctrine can be attached to the use of the chasuble or any other kindred vestment may be

[1] X. Barbier de Montault, *loc. cit.*

[2] Michael Rajewsky, *Euchologion der Orthodox-katholischen Kirche*, Wien, Zamarski, 1861, Th. I. p. xxv. The editor was chaplain to the Russian Embassy in Vienna. The representation of the shortened chasuble given by this writer would seem to make it reach just to the elbows.

gathered from its use in the Lutheran communities of Germany and Scandinavia. A German writer of the eighteenth century is under the belief that the chasuble was usually worn in his time in the Church of England at the celebration of the Eucharist, just as it was then the custom in Germany in some places for the preacher who consecrated to wear a chasuble. The Puritans, he says, left the English Church because of their attitude on the vestiary question[1].

The evidence of a German as to the customs of the English Church may not be received without a certain amount of hesitation. But in speaking of the customs of his own country, his account may surely be accepted, as contemporary evidence is accepted.

Pater Braun, as likely as anyone to emphasize the sacerdotal or sacrificial import of the chasuble, remarks at the beginning of his notes on the Lutheran use of this vestment, that it was not worn to encourage anything Catholic: "Etwas spezifisch Katholisches war freilich das Zustutzen des Gewandes nicht"; and he tells us that in Denmark and Sweden the chasuble is still worn in protestant worship, and that even in Germany the alb and chasuble were in use up to the eighteenth century, and the use of these vestments was only left off in 1810 at Nuremberg, and in the same century in

[1] Johann Georg Walch, *Historische und theologische Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten*, dritte Auflage, Jena, Meyers, 1733 [Theil (? Part VI.)], p. 479.

Hanover and Saxony[1]. Daniel, the German ritualist, has a long note on the continued use of the alb and chasuble in German churches. The kings of Prussia interfered to enjoin or forbid this use. Frederick William, the father of Frederick the Second, commonly called the Great, forbade the use of the chasuble; but Frederick himself, the Freethinker, on becoming king, tried to restore it[2]. Had this only been known to those about the Emperor Joseph the Second, what a fine *tu quoque* there might have been to the gibe of "my brother the sacristan."

Before leaving the liturgical consideration of the *paenula* or chasuble, it may be worth while to draw attention to the large use made of the alb and chasuble in the mosaics of Ravenna, especially in those of the New St Apollinaris. Scenes from gospel history represent a number of persons of secondary importance, who wear alb and chasuble; and in passing, it may be noted that nearly all show the chasuble hitched up on the right shoulder, so as to give greater freedom to the right arm. Amongst persons wearing the alb and chasuble are the Pharisee

[1] Joseph Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Freiburg in B. 1907, p. 197.

[2] H. A. Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Lutheranae in epitomen redactus*, Lipsiae, Weigel, 1848, pp. 90–92, note. It would not be the first time in history that vestments and lights had been adopted to serve a political end. In a review of Dr Lindsay's *History of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, Clark, in two volumes, 1906–7), published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1907, p. 630, Dr B. J. Kidd remarks that Elizabeth may have retained the vestments, cross, and lights in order to rank as a Lutheran, and so secure protection from the Emperor under the Peace of Augsburg.

and Publican[1]; the two blind men who are healed by our Lord; and his companions going with him on a journey, as to Emmaus; or those who carry him to the chief priests. Our Lord is easily distinguished by the cruciform nimbus, but in no case does he wear alb and chasuble.

In the mosaics of St Mary Major at Rome there are also two or three instances of albs and chasubles being worn by indifferent persons[2].

To the opinion of Pater Braun that the cope is first developed in the eleventh century, it may be further objected that the mosaics of the sixth century in the churches of Ravenna and elsewhere show what cannot be mistaken for anything but the vestment which we call a cope[3]. It has almost a sacrificial or sacerdotal association. For example, at St Apollinaris in Classe, there is a setting forth of three kinds of sacrifices mentioned in the Old Testament: Abel on the left of the mosaic offers a lamb; Abraham on the right is ready to offer his son Isaac; while in the centre, with the Holy Table before him, Melchisedec in cope and morse offers his unbloody sacrifice of bread and wine[4]. In the church of St Vitalis the

[1] This mosaic has been reproduced in Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1888, t. VII. pl. DLXII.

[2] G. B. de Rossi, *Musaici cristiani...delle Chiese di Roma*, Roma, Spithoever, no date [? 1872], St Mary Major, fasc. xi. xx.

[3] My notes on the mosaics in the churches at Ravenna are derived from personal observation, confirmed by photographs. The notes on the mosaics of St Mary Major at Rome are drawn from G. B. de Rossi's *op. cit.* My last visits to Rome and Ravenna were in April and May, 1914.

[4] See plate VIII. It shows how much ideas upon the priestly



Melchisedec, Abraham, Isaac, and Abel

(From photograph of Mosaic in St Apollinaris in Classe at Ravenna.) Middle figure is Melchisedec, that on his right is Abel, on left Abraham and Isaac.

same subject is also represented, but the figures are limited to Abel and Melchisedec ; Melchisedec wears cope and morse, over a *tunica*, elevating a round loaf of bread while the cup remains on the Table before him. One of the mosaics of St Mary Major at Rome shows Melchisedec after the slaughter of the kings meeting Abraham with bread and wine. He also wears a cope and morse. In the mosaics of the new St Apollinaris are shown certain episodes in the life of our Lord[1]. The Jewish chief priest to whom Judas is about to return the thirty pieces of silver wears cope and morse ; also the high priest standing behind our Lord while Pilate washes his hands ; each of the three chief priests to whom our Lord is about to be given over, wears cope and morse. In the first instances spoken of the cope would seem to accompany a sacrificial act ; in those following to be worn by members of the Levitical sacrificing priesthood.

At Parenzo, also in a mosaic of the sixth century, is a figure with a nimbus, but unnamed, wearing a cope and morse, and having a censer in his hand.

vestments had changed between the sixth and the twelfth centuries, if we compare the mosaic of Melchisedec at Ravenna with an embroidered panel in a chasuble at St Blaise in the Black Forest. At Ravenna he has cope and morse : in the Black Forest he stands at an altar in alb, stole, dalmatic, chasuble, and maniple, and holds in his hand a chalice and circular obley. (Gustav Heider, *Liturgische Gewänder aus dem Stifte St. Blasien in Schwarzwalde*, Wien, besonderer Abdruck aus dem IV. Bande des Jahrbuches der K. K. central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale, 1860, Taf. III. B, plate IX.)

[1] See Mosaic of Melchisedec, plate VIII.

It will be acknowledged that the cope and morse as ecclesiastical ornaments were known as early as the sixth century.

It may be useful to quote here the passage from Dr Adrian Fortescue's work on the vestments, for both he and Pater Braun belong to a community where the dominant teaching is that the chasuble is the sacerdotal or sacrificial vestment[1], and therefore ought not to be allied in a common origin with the cope, which any layman may wear.

The cope (*cappa, pluviale*) is nothing but the old large chasuble divided in front, so as to be easier to put on, and then joined again by a clasp (the morse).... But the undivided paenula, as being the older form, was kept for more solemn functions, such as Mass. The divided paenula (our cope) took its place on less important occasions, and so began to be considered a separate vestment.... The Eastern rites still know no distinction between these two garments[2].

This last remark of Dr Fortescue is quite in the spirit of one of the best French ritualists of the eighteenth century, Pierre Le Brun, whom even Dom Prosper Guéranger is forced to praise as one

[1] In the ordination of Roman priests the bishop says to each one, as he puts the chasuble upon him, *Accipe vestem sacerdotalem*. (See *Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII.* Antverpiae, Plantin, 1765, p. 50.) To quote a dictum of Monseigneur X. Barbier de Montault (*Le Costume et les Usages ecclésiastiques selon la tradition romaine*, Paris, Letouzey, no date [? 1897], t. II. 77): "La chasuble est le vêtement propre du prêtre, le seul avec lequel il puisse célébrer le saint sacrifice. D'où il est facile de déduire qu'on ne peut l'employer autrement, sinon dans les cas déterminés par le droit."

[2] Adrian Fortescue, *The Vestments of the Roman Rite*, London, Catholic Truth Society, no date [? 1912], p. 15, note 1.

of the later liturgical writers that France has produced worthy of the name; and to allow that his knowledge equalled his orthodoxy[1]. The rubric in Le Brun before the prayer at the vesting of the Armenian priest with the cope is:

À la chasuble en forme de chape[2].

"At the Chasuble in the shape of the cope," a plain admission that the so-called chasuble is only a cope. And I cannot forbear quoting a passage much to the same effect from another Roman Catholic clergyman, the Rev. William Lockhart. He is speaking of the ancient form of the chasuble:

It had an opening in the centre to admit the head, and it hung down in graceful folds, like a mantle, reaching almost to the feet. In fact, it was, as we shall see, no less a *vestis talaris* than the cassock. The ancient chasuble, in fact, differed from the cope, only in the latter being cut up the front, and being furnished with a cape, which originally could be drawn over the head like the cowl of a monk[3].

It may be observed that the hooded *paenula* is by no means rare; it was for use in bad weather. The statements of Dr Fortescue and Mr Lockhart are in line with those of Dr Brightman, who defines the Eastern chasuble as

The supervestment of priests; in form a semicircle of material put on like a western cope and sewn up the

[1] Prosper Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, Le Mans et Paris, 1841, t. II. p. 544.

[2] Pierre Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe*, Paris, Valade, 1778, t. v. p. 75, Diss. x. Art. ix.

[3] William Lockhart, *The Chasuble: its genuine form and size*, London, Burns and Oates, 1891, p. 60.

front, thus enveloping the person and requiring to be drawn up over the arms to allow of action. The Greek chasùble is still in this form, slightly shortened in front, and provided with buttons &c. by means of which the front can be folded and held up so as to leave the arms free.... In Russia the front is generally cut out, leaving a fall of about nine inches from the neck. In all other oriental rites the chasuble has been opened down the front and is only fastened on the breast, becoming in effect a western cope[1].

Dr Brightman's definition of the Eastern chasuble makes it indeed a cope: it is semicircular, like the Western cope; and then, so that it shall envelope the whole person, the division in front of the chest is brought together, and the sides, where are the arms and shoulders of the celebrant, are hitched up to allow free action of the hands. The Eastern chasuble is in fact the old divided *paenula* of which something has been said in the foregoing pages. It will, I trust, now be acknowledged that the chasuble and cope are the same vestment.

In the scholarly Report of the Five Bishops on the Ornaments of the Church and Ministers, presented to the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation in 1908, it is perhaps asserted with too great emphasis that the parent of the cope is the *lacerna*[2]. It has been a pride to me to follow the

[1] F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. I. Eastern Liturgies, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896, p. 592. For other references to the connexion of the cope with the chasuble, see J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement*, Longmans, 1914, p. 362 in ch. xii.

[2] *The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers*, 1908, No. 416. S.P.C.K. 1908, pp. 12, 13.

A Libertus in divided Paenula

(From I. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*, Traject. ad Rhen. Halma, 1697, t. vi. col. 1170. See also W. A. Becker and H. Göll, *Gallus*, Berlin, Calvary, 1882, Th. iii. S. 216, from the Museum of the Vatican)

main thesis of the Report that the Christian liturgical dress is:

> simply the adaptation to religious use of the ordinary dress of civil, and particularly of official, life in the Roman Empire in the first centuries of our era[1].

But in a matter of detail such as the origin of the cope it may be allowed us to differ from the statement of the bishops, without such an expression of opinion being thought disrespectful.

In Bartolus Bartholinus' valuable tract on the *paenula* there is a representation of a non-Christian *paenula*, which is divided almost up to the neck, and the right portion of the garment is thrown over the shoulder to render more free the use of the right arm[2]. The *tunica* under the *paenula* is short, coming only to the knees, but it is girded and has wide sleeves. The portion of the *paenula* left in front of the upper chest can hardly be more than six inches in depth if we judge by the proportions of the rest of the figure. Göll has reproduced this figure from the Museum of the Vatican, under the section of his book on the *paenula*[3].

In the East to this day, the vestment worn at the holy Eucharist is much nearer to this divided form of the *paenula* than to the undivided. Dr Brightman's description of the Greek vestment recalls the divided

[1] *Ibid.* § 1, Introduction, p. 5.

[2] Bartolus Bartholinus, *De paenula*, cap. iv. in I. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*, Traj. ad Rhen. Halma, 1697, t. vi. col. 1170. It is reproduced as plate ix.

[3] W. A. Becker and H. Göll, *Gallus*, Berlin, Calvary, 1882, Th. iii. p. 216.

paenula far more than the chasuble of the West does[1]. And in Western miniatures may be seen vestments quite like the *paenula* of Bartolus Bartholinus, and instances of such have been given above[2].

It will, we may think, be owned on all sides that antiquities are much better understood now than at the end of the middle ages, and that the meanings and symbolism attributed to customs and ornaments in the popular estimation of the middle ages are not so surely established that they may be insisted upon nowadays for acceptance by everybody. Because "young Charbon the puritan and old Poysam the papist" were agreed in the interpretation of certain ceremonies, it does not therefore follow that their opinions must not be questioned. Neither puritan nor papist was qualified to judge. It is not reasonable to-day to demand of those who have made so much fuller a study of antiquities, a blindfold acceptance of the opinions in vogue in the sixteenth and some part of the seventeenth centuries, but which have been rejected by scholars ever since the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Either chasuble or cope is a comely and decent vestment in which the higher offices of the Church may be performed for the greater dignity of the act of worship. But no doctrine is involved in the acceptance of the use of either. In the Church of England it is a mere matter of obedience to the law set out in the rubric preceding the Order for

[1] F. E. Brightman, *loc. cit.*

[2] See above.

Morning Prayer, which enjoins a fitting and appropriate following of a custom which had existed in the Church for centuries.

If we are to accept the opinion that the chasuble is essentially a sacerdotal or sacrificial vestment because such has been the opinion in certain quarters in the West for near a thousand years, the next question that must certainly be met is: Where are we to stop in accepting opinions begun in the middle ages? Are we to be forced also to accept the mediaeval opinion that the Christian vestments are derived from the Jewish, and the liturgical colours from the Levitical? Or the fanciful teachings of Durandus and of St Thomas of Aquinum on ceremonies and rites? And opinions of far greater importance than any connected with ceremonies or rites will have to be dealt with, if we have to receive as established the doctrines of the mediaeval writers when they are unanimous and agreed.

CHAPTER VI

THE CONSULAR *VESTIS TRIUMPHALIS* AND CERTAIN EPISCOPAL ORNAMENTS

The official dress of the consul appears to have had such influence upon the liturgical vesture of the Church that it may be well to take the several consular ornaments into consideration by themselves, under one heading. These consular ornaments are well shown in the ivory diptychs that have by good fortune been preserved for the antiquary and student. Of these diptychs the Society of Antiquaries has at Burlington House a fine collection of casts, and the same may be said of the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. I am much indebted for my knowledge of the diptychs to both of these collections of casts, in default of being able to resort to the originals, which are much scattered.

The number of these consular diptychs that have come down to us can be placed at 28, if we are strict in excluding the uncertain and anonymous specimens. If we be less rigid, they may be reckoned at some 38. They were produced between the years of our Lord 406 and 541[1].

[1] G. Bloch, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, Paris, Hachette, t. i. partie ii. sub voce *consul*, p. 1476.

A careful examination of these consular diptychs will throw much light on the history of three Christian vestures: the *tunica*, the dalmatic, and the *omophorion* or archiepiscopal pall. The diptychs represent the consul in his high official dress, whether administering justice[1], or giving the signal for the games to begin. Marquardt uses for this dress the name *Vestis triumphalis*[2], as he thinks it goes back to dress worn on the day of triumph by the victorious soldier. With great diligence Mr Rushforth has collected from various authors the different robes and other decorations that were given to the general on this great occasion.

> The dress of the general...consisted of a flowered tunic (*tunica palmata*) and gold embroidered robe (*toga picta*) both of purple (Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 34, Liv. x. 7. 2). In his right hand he carried a laurel bough (Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 32; Plin. *H. N.* xv. § 137) and in his left an ivory sceptre crowned by an eagle (Dionys. III. 61, N. 47; Val. Max. IV. 4, 5, Juv. x. 43)[3].

The dress of the consul exhibited in the diptychs shows a marked agreement with this description, and it seems reasonable to accept Marquardt's opinion so

[1] This seems to be the best explanation of the consular diptych of Rufius Probianus. (Em. Molinier, *Ivoires*, planche IV. in *Histoire générale des Arts appliqués* &c. Paris, Levy, 1896, t. I. against p. 40.)

[2] Joachim Marquardt, *Privatleben der Römer*, 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1886, Th. I. p. 542.

[3] G. Mc N. Rushforth, in Wm Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, Murray, 1891, vol. II. col. 896. Much the same account is given in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, Paris, Hachette, 1913, fasc. xlix. sub voce *triumphus*, p. 490.

far as to distinguish the different ornaments of the consul as they appear in the diptychs by the names employed to denote those of the victorious general on the day of his triumph. It may be as well to take them one by one, beginning with the innermost and proceeding to the outermost.

The similarity of the dress shown by the consular diptychs to that of early ecclesiastics may be grasped when it is understood that some of these consular diptychs have, with but little change, been converted into memorials of bishops and popes. We have one very remarkable instance. A consular diptych converted into a memorial of St Gregory the Great is still preserved in the collections of casts in our museums[1].

It may perhaps make the subject of the *vestis triumphalis* a little clearer if we begin with the chief garments of the consul, and leave the smaller ornaments, the *scipio eburneus*, the *calceus*, and others, for later discussion.

First, then, let us compare the *Tunica palmata* (*Tunica*) with the Alb or Surplice.

(2) The *Toga picta* with the Σάκκος, or Dalmatic.

(3) The *Pallium* with the *Omophorion*, or Pall, worn by bishops.

(a) Tunica palmata and alb or surplice.

It has been said above that the *tunica* or alb has a close connexion in history with the *paenula* or

[1] See plate XI. of consular diptychs.



A Chasuble, semicircular in shape

(From Martin Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, Typis San-Blasianis, 1776, Pars III. Tab. VI. See also pp. 247 and 266 of Pars I of Gerbert. See Plate X on next page)

The same, as worn by a priest

(From Martin Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, Typis San-Blasianis, 1776, Pars III. Tab. VI. See also pp. 247 and 266 of Pars I.)

chasuble[1], and that the two are found worn together in numerous instances. The *tunica* was the under, the *paenula* the outer, garment. The *tunica* corresponds to the linen shirt in modern times, upon which the rest of the clothes are worn. Of the *tunica* there were various forms. It might reach barely to the knees, or come down to the ankles. It might be sleeveless: if it had sleeves, these might be close fitting or flowing. St Augustine alludes to the difference that time brought about in fashion, and what they meant. Of old, it was almost a crime to wear sleeved tunics that came down to the heels. In his time, it was accounted a crime in men of respectable birth, if, when they wore the *tunica*, it was not sleeved and long[1].

The consular diptych shows at the wrists and at the feet a garment with tight sleeves, reaching to the ankles. This is almost universal; and, without much demand upon our receptive powers, it may be recognised as the every day linen tunic, adorned and glorified. For every day use the tunic would doubtless return to the simplicity of white linen; and in this state, it is easy to see how the *tunica*, coming down to the feet, and with tight sleeves, became the parent of the alb: and how by making other changes, in accordance with its past history, it early became the surplice; later, the rochet; or again, once more deprived of the sleeves, the *colobium*[2]. The linen

[1] St Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, lib. III. cap. xi. § 20. (Migne, *P. L.* XXXIV. 74.)

[2] Claude de Vert, *Explication simple...des Cérémonies de l'Eglise*, Paris, Delaulne, 1708, t. II. pp. 266–276. On planche V. there

garment worn under the chasuble in the early Christian mosaics of Rome and Ravenna, as often as not, shows wide open sleeves like those of the surplice. This may be well seen in the *tunica* under the chasuble of Maximianus, the bishop of Ravenna, in the often described mosaic of St Vitalis. It is in effect a surplice worn in the place of an alb, a difference hardly worth noting.

Besides the mosaic of Maximianus there are frescoes of the eighth century, reproduced by de Rossi, in which the large and ample sleeves of the surplice are seen under the *paenula* and pall[1]. In fact, before the tenth century, representations are frequent enough of the *paenula* worn immediately over the surplice.

(b) The Toga Picta of Consuls and the Σάκκος or Dalmatic of Bishops.

Another result of a careful examination of the consular diptych is that it becomes evident that the consul is wearing over the *tunica* or alb a garment that is highly ornamented or embroidered. It reaches almost down to the feet, not completely concealing the *tunica*, but it has sleeves much wider and shorter than those of the *tunica*, which allow these latter to be seen, for the former only reach to the elbow. This

is a series of engravings showing the alb, surplice, and rochet beginning as the same thing, undergoing changes in time, until the rochet became a mere band of linen hanging from the neck.

[1] G. B. de Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana*, Roma, Cromolitografia pontificia, 1864, t. I. tavole vi. vii. The four figures wear what may be called the three primitive vestments, the pall, the chasuble, and the surplice, in actual use, as in the mosaic of Maximianus at Ravenna. See plate VI.

is the *Toga Picta*, as it is called. It will be evident at once how close a resemblance it bears to the ornament now worn by the bishops of the West under the chasuble, and by the Greek metropolitans and all Russian bishops without the chasuble. Dr Brightman says :

> In place of the chasuble Greek metropolitans and all Russian bishops wear the Sakkos (*σάκκος*, slav. *sakkos*), a loose-sleeved tunic, identical in form with the Western dalmatic[1].

In *Liber Pontificalis* will be noticed the statement that Sylvester the First ordered deacons to wear dalmatics[2]. In a work once attributed to St Augustine, it is said that deacons nowadays do not wear dalmatics like bishops[3]. The mere shape of the dalmatic is so widely spread all over the world "from China to Peru," a shape imitated in the modern frock coat, that we can hardly attribute to the garment any clerical significance.

The dalmatic is common to the deacon and subdeacon; though many vain efforts have been made to establish a distinction between the vestment worn by the deacon and that worn by the subdeacon. In

[1] F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896, vol. I. Eastern Liturgies, p. 592.

[2] *Le Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, Thorin, 1886, t. I. pp. 76, 77.

[3] St Augustine, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, ex veteri § xlvi. (Migne, *P. L.* xxxiv. (Appendix), 2246 Quasi non hodie diaconi dalmaticis induuntur sicut episcopi.) Upon the question of authorship should be consulted Alexander Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, Texts and Studies published by the Cambridge University Press, 1905, p. 177, note.

reality they are one. In each of the three principal varieties of Christian vestments there is no real or essential difference; between the subdeacon's tunicle and the deacon's dalmatic; between the linen alb and the surplice; between the chasuble and the cope. The dalmatic and the alb, it may be remarked, are those in which some attempt has been made to follow the outline of the human figure. They differ chiefly in their material; the dalmatic is of silk, the alb of linen.

(c) Pallium and Omophorion or Pall.

If we once more examine the consular diptychs, those acquainted with the present disposition of the *omophorion* in the East, or with the early arrangement of the Christian pall in the West, will be struck by the resemblance of the consular ornament to the episcopal ensign. It is so great that the conclusion can hardly be resisted that the consular ornament is the parent of the episcopal.

It seems possible that the first person who uttered the word *Omophorion* in connexion with the scarf seen in the consular diptychs was a member of the Society of Jesus, Alexander Wiltheim. He had edited a consular diptych preserved at Liège, and soon after a new edition of the works of Epiphanius came out, to which was prefixed a portrait of the Father in chasuble and *omophorion*[1]. The portrait may well be

[1] The original edition of Alexander Wiltheim's work is in the British Museum, shelf-mark 202. f. 14. Title: *Diptychon Leodiense ex consulari factum episcopale*, Leodii, Hovius, 1659, Appendix,

Consular Diptych adapted to commemorate St Gregory the Great

(From a cast in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, F. I. 11 i.)

Consular Diptych, sixth century

(From a cast in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, F. I. 106)

of some antiquity, for the *epigonation* on the right side is half hidden by the chasuble, much as it is hidden in the mosaics of twelfth century bishops at Cefalù and elsewhere in Sicily[1]. It would seem that any one fresh from the study of the consular diptychs could hardly escape noticing the resemblance between the *omophorion* of the Greek bishop and the *pallium*, or whatever name we give it, of the consul. By the law of the Theodosian Codex, a scarf or pall of divers colours is ordered to be worn over the alb and chasuble by senators, to show their rank[2].

Liturgists seem to be agreed that the episcopal ensign represents the consular ornament[3]; but they vary in their views of the origin of the consular ornament. It is not important now to decide whether the consul is wearing the toga, reduced by repeated foldings to a mere scarf, which may be the opinion of Monsignor Wilpert[4]; or whether the scarf worn by the consul be only another appearance of the classical *pallium*; and this, reduced, like the toga in the theory of Monsignor Wilpert, to a mere scarf by folding it lengthwise five or six times, and then forcibly com-

cap. ii. p. 9, in folio. It looks as if it had been reprinted very carefully in A. F. Gori, *Thesaurus Veterum Diptychorum*, Florentiae, Albizzini, 1759, t. i. p. 1. The portrait of St Epiphanius is the frontispiece to the first volume of his *Opera omnia*, ed. Dion. Petavius, Coloniae, Schrey and Meier, 1682, in folio.

[1] See below, p. 76.

[2] See above, p. 25.

[3] L. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte chrétien*, Paris, Fontemoing, 1898, 2e éd. p. 372.

[4] Giuseppe Wilpert, *Un capitolo di storia del vestiario*, published in *Arte*, 1898, Roma, Danesi, Anno i. p. 94.

pressing the ornament[1]. When, however, a civil ornament passes into the service of the Church it is somewhat rare for it to retain the name that it bore in the civil use, and this may be some reason against thinking that the *omophorion* or pall is descended from the classical *pallium*. We may be divided in opinion whether the consular scarf have its source in the *pallium* or the toga. But when once it is allowed by all that the *omophorion* or *pallium* has its antecedent in the consular scarf, it is not of such interest to the student of Christian vesture to determine which of the two may have been its ultimate source.

To this folding of the toga or *pallium* as supposed by the antiquaries, there is a parallel in the use of the chasuble by the deacon and subdeacon in Advent and Lent. This ornament is folded, so as to look like a mere stole, and then called *planeta plicata*, and worn over the left shoulder of the deacon when he is about to read the gospel[2]. In the same way it will be noticed that the *mappula* becomes the maniple by being folded in many pleats[3].

It may be observed, in opposition to the idea that the *omophorion* or pall is an ornament specially

[1] G. Leroux, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, no date, Paris, Hachette, t. IV. première partie, sub voce *pallium*, p. 293. This seems to be allied to the theory of Philip Vespasiani (*De Sacri Pallii origine*, Romae, typ. de propaganda fide, 1856). On the other hand, Dr Daniel Rock seems to hold firmly that the toga is the forerunner of the pall (*Church of our Fathers*, London, Dolman, 1849, vol. p. 130).

[2] *Missale Romanum*, Romae, Soc. S. Ioannis, Desclée, 1911, p. xxix., *Rubriceae generales* XIX. § 6.

[3] See below, p. 64.

episcopal, that it is to be found represented as a decoration on figures besides those of bishops. For example, in the ancient church underneath the basilica of St Clement at Rome there appear representations of archangels, SS. Michael and Gabriel, wearing *omophoria* in the Eastern fashion; they stand on each side of Our Lord, while a prelate, named St Clement, on the right wears the pall arranged as in the West[1]. We may find the like in a pre-Norman illuminated manuscript, where angels are depicted wearing palls[2]. And even in a painting so late as the seventeenth century, perhaps, which exists in the Coptic Church of Abu Sargah, there is a representation of St Michael in a scarf arranged like that of the consular diptychs[3].

In the Benedictional of St Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester from A.D. 963 to 984, the first leaf has a group of three figures, St Gregory, St Cuthbert, and St Benedict, each of whom bears a pall inscribed with his name and title. St Gregory standing on the right of St Benedict, being pope, would of course bear a pall, but St Cuthbert on the left also has a pall though he was only a bishop. The artist seems to introduce the pall into this picture merely as a mark of dignity, not as an ensign of office[4].

[1] A photograph may be found in Joseph Mullooly, *St Clement Pope and Martyr*, Rome, Barbèra, 1873, opposite p. 302.

[2] British Museum, MS. Nero, C. IV. leaf 30.

[3] Alfred J. Butler, *Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1884, vol. II. p. 159, fig. 26.

[4] *The benedictional of Saint Æthelwold, reproduced in facsimile*, ed. by George Frederic Warner and Henry Austin Wilson, Oxford, Roxburghe Club, 1910.

If the pall be the scarf derived from that on the consular vesture, and so much of the consular vesture (Σάκκος or dalmatic) have been borrowed for the use of the bishop, it is not surprising to find the pall or *omophorion* common to all the bishops in the East[1]. Apparently this was also once the case in some parts of the West, in Gaul for example; for the council of Mâcon in A.D. 581 orders that bishops shall not celebrate mass without the pall. Of late years the passage in the manuscripts has been looked into, and it has been found that where it was once thought that the text had *archbishops* the true reading is *bishops*. Thus it is bishops that are not to say mass without the pall[2], and so all bishops must have been entitled to wear it.

But this use of the pall by bishops in the West has long been restricted. It is now only given to those metropolitans or archbishops who are in communion with the Roman pontiff, or bishops whom he especially designs to honour.

It may be noticed that the pall does not seem to have been known in Ireland before the days of St Malachi who was Archbishop of Armagh in the twelfth century. His life was written by St Bernard, who tells us that this Archbishop of Armagh went to

[1] Isaac Habert, *Archieratikon, Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Graecae*, Parisiis, Billaine, 1676, p. 25, "Episcopos omnes ab antiquo Pallium gestasse."

[2] Edgar Loening, *Das Kirchenrecht im Reiche der Merowinger*, in *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts*, Strassburg, 1878, Bd II. p. 94, note.

Rome in the time of Innocent the Second, by whom the pall was granted to him[1].

(d) Balteus and Girdle.

It would be natural to find that a long garment reaching to the feet, such as was the *tunica* or alb, needed to be confined with a girdle in order that its length might not hinder the wearer in walking. In the house and at meals this girdle was unloosed[2]. So it is that a large number of the representations of the civil *tunica* show a girdle round the waist of the wearer of the *tunica*. In the vestiary law of the *Codex Theodosianus* the *tunica*, alb, or under garment of the senator was to be girded[3]. It is not pushing resemblances too far if it be suggested that the girdle which now binds the alb about the loins of the Christian priest is derived from this girdle of the *tunica*.

(e) Mappa and Maniple.

In most of the consular diptychs the consul holds in his right hand a handkerchief which he is about to throw down as a signal for the beginning of the games. This ensign is considered by the antiquaries to be one of the more noteworthy of the consular ornaments. From being a consular ornament it seems to have passed into the service of the Church, quite as a mark

[1] Laur. Surius, *De Vitis Sanctorum*, Venetiis, 1581, t. VI. fo. 32. Novemb. 5.

[2] Joseph Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Koeln, Bachem, 1898, p. 2.

[3] See above, p. 25.

of dignity, as something borrowed from the consular ornaments naturally would be.

From being simply a square or oblong piece of linen grasped in the left hand, it was folded in three or four pleats so that the length became much greater than the breadth, and it then looked as if length were its predominant feature. Being then hung over the hand, between the thumb and the fingers, it thus became the ornament which we may see in the Bayeux tapestry[1], or in a fresco of the underground church of St Clement at Rome[2]. Save for being held between the fingers and not hung over the wrist the ornament is identical with the modern maniple.

According to *Liber Pontificalis* Pope Sylvester the First ordained that deacons should have their left hands covered by *pallia linostima*, some kind of linen handkerchief[3]. Near three hundred years after the time of St Sylvester, Pope Gregory the Great grants a similar privilege to the deacons of Ravenna, somewhat unwillingly, and only to the first deacons of that church (*primis diaconibus vestris*), and forbids the use of the *mappula* to others[4]. Still, at the time

[1] Stigand, in all the reproductions of the Bayeux tapestry, stands by the throne of Harold in chasuble, stole, and maniple, which latter is held between the forefinger and thumb of left hand. (See plate IV.)

[2] Joseph Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Koeln, Bachem, 1898, fig. 26. For reproductions of other early ways of holding the *mappula* see Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1888, t. VII. pl. DXXIII bis— pl. DXXVI.

[3] *Le Liber Pontificalis*, edited by L. Duchesne, Paris, Thorin 1886, t. I. p. 76, col. i.

[4] Gregory the Great, *Epistolarum* lib. III. Indict. xi. Ep. lvi. (Migne, *P. L.* LXXVII. 654).

of the visit of Dom Edmund Martène and Dom Ursin Durand in the first decade of the eighteenth century, the choir boys at Cluny are spoken of as wearing albs and maniples[1].

Thus as late as the eighteenth century the maniple was not everywhere restricted to men in holy orders. St Thomas of Aquinum, fond as he is of mystical significations, yet tells us after all that the maniple is only a handkerchief for wiping the face[2].

And the same is the opinion of J. S. Durant, who cites a number of mediaeval ritualists to this effect, that the maniple formerly served the purpose of an ordinary handkerchief[3]. There seems to be no evidence that the chalice was ever touched with it. Here Dom Claude de Vert speaks, somewhat uncertainly, just when one might have expected him to be firm[4]. But even Dr Neale, who grasps every opportunity of bringing forward mystical reasons, admits that the maniple was at first a mere handkerchief[5].

From being a mere cloth designed at first to wipe the forehead or face, the maniple is now strictly limited to those in holy orders. Indeed, a Roman

[1] [Edm. Martène and Ursin Durand], *Voyage littéraire de deux Religieux bénédictins*, etc., Paris, 1717, Partie I. p. 229.

[2] St Thomas of Aquinum, *in quartum librum Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, Distinct. xxiv. Qu. iii. Art. iii. (in *Opera omnia*, Venetiis, 1593, t. VI. fo. 145 *b*).

[3] J. S. Durant, *De Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, lib. II. cap. ix. § 16. Lugduni, Landry, 1606, p. 255. He was a lawyer by profession and was murdered by the mob in 1589.

[4] Claude de Vert, *Explication simple...des cérémonies de l'Église*, Paris, 1706, t. I. p. 194 *note*; but then see t. II. pp. 289—299.

[5] J. M. Neale, *A history of the Holy Eastern Church*, Part I. General Introduction, London, Masters, 1850, p. 311.

Catholic writer has gone so far as to say that "the maniple, more than the chasuble, is the Eucharist vestment[1].'

(f) The Scipio eburneus and the Episcopal Crosier.

While in one hand the consul holds the *mappa*, in the left he bears the ivory rod of his office, *scipio eburneus*. *Scipio* was a staff carried by persons of wealth, of rank, and of high official position, and it is therefore not surprising to find it among the ensigns of consuls and bishops. It is one of the earliest of the episcopal ornaments, being spoken of by Isidore of Seville as being given to the bishop at his consecration[2].

When it was the fashion to see in all Christian ceremonies and ornaments only the dregs and relics of the worship of Jupiter or Venus, the pastoral staff of bishops was claimed as the survival of the *lituus* of the augur, because this was curved at the top, distantly recalling the shepherd's crook of the pastoral staff of the middle ages. But this reason loses much of its force when it is remembered that even the curve at the top of the episcopal staff did not make its appearance till near the end of the first thousand years after Christ, and the fully developed shepherd's crook later still. And the crook is also thought by many antiquaries to be particular to the West.

[1] Adrian Fortescue, *The Mass*, Longmans, 1914, p. 227, note 1.

[2] Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. II. cap. v. (M. Hittorp, *De divinis*, etc., Parisiis, 1610, col. 205 E.)

Père Arthur Martin, S.J., while rejecting the theory that the *lituus* of the augurs was the forerunner of the episcopal staff, yet allows the possibility of its having been borrowed from the sceptre of the Byzantine Emperors[1]. A borrowing of the sceptre for Christian purposes may be seen in a diptych, now in the British Museum, of the archangel Michael attributed by the Catalogue to the fourth century. The archangel bears in his left hand a *scipio* which is of greater height than his own figure. It is surmounted by a sphere and ends below in a smaller ball. In his right hand he carries a globe and cross very like that given to sovereigns on the day of their crowning and anointing[2].

We have seen that in early ages of the Church the figures of angels and saints, and persons not usually considered to have a right to the pall, have been depicted with this ornament[3]. In the same way, it is said that the staff may be seen in the hands of angels and archangels, as we have seen it in the diptych of St Michael, just spoken of, in later drawings and up to the twelfth century.

Mr Rushforth remarks that the *Scipio eburneus* is usually surmounted by an eagle, but this practice does not survive universally in the period of the

[1] Barrault and Arthur Martin, *Le Baton pastoral, étude archéologique*, Paris, Poussielgue-Rusand, 1856, p. 18. Extrait du Tome IV. des *Mélanges d'Archéologie*.

[2] O. M. Dalton, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities*, London, printed by order of the Trustees, 1901, p. 53 (No. 295) and pl. VIII.

[3] Above, p. 61.

consular diptychs. In these there is seen what may be the imperial busts, a globe, the end of a lance, or other ornaments which the hand of time has made it hard to recognise. A globe may not unfrequently be recognised in the early Christian crosiers; it may be noticed in the staff carried by the archangel Michael which has just been described. But a feature that has often been looked upon as characteristic of the episcopal staff, the hook or curve like a shepherd's crook, does not appear in the East or West until we approach A.D. 1000. In the East it does not appear to be seen; and in the West it shows itself first as a bend at a right angle, at the top of the staff, like that of a modern walking stick.

The globe surmounts the episcopal staff in the West as late as the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, a book written in the opinion of good judges "during the latter part of the tenth century in the New Minster of Winchester[1]." A drawing of the bishop with a staff surmounted by a globe or circle is given by Dr Rock[2].

The Sacramentary of Autun, in a representation of the episcopal blessing formerly given before communion, has an early instance of the curve at the top of the pastoral staff then held in the hand of the abbot or bishop[3]. This manuscript is assigned by Monsieur

[1] H. A. Wilson, *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, London, Henry Bradshaw Society, 1903, p. xi.

[2] Daniel Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, London, Dolman, 1849, vol. II. p. 24.

[3] Léopold Delisle, *Le Sacramentaire d'Autun*, Extrait de la *Gazette archéologique* de 1884, Paris, Levy, pl. 22. The MS. was

Léopold Delisle to the middle of the ninth century. Rohault de Fleury reproduces a large number of the heads of bishops' staves, but to these it would be unwise to assign a precise date[1].

The crosier is usually borne in the left hand, while the *lituus*, it may be remarked, was held in the right. Thus at the end of the rite of consecration, just before *Te Deum*, the crosier is placed in the left hand of the new consecrated bishop[2]; and in most functions the bishop bears the crosier in his left hand[3]. There is here a likeness between the usual bearing of the consular staff in the left hand and the bearing of the bishop's staff in his left.

If there be any resemblance between the lengths of the *Scipio eburneus* borne in the left hand of the consul in the diptychs and of the episcopal staff, it will be easily conceived that the early staff was of no great length. It might very well be only of the length of the walking stick of to-day. It has been thought to strengthen the opinion that the crosier is derived from the *scipio* by considering the small length of the latter, and the following account of a supposed early crosier is brought forward. St Gregory of Tours in his account of St Severinus of Bordeaux says that Amandus, being warned in a vision to go out and meet St Severinus,

No. 19 *bis* in the library of the seminary of Autun. It was written for Marmoutiers, Tours. See also John Gage, *Archaeologia*, vol. xxv. 1835.

[1] Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, Paris, 1889, t. VIII. Crosses, pl. DCXLI. to pl. DCXLVIII.

[2] *Pontificale Romanum*, Antverpiae, Plantin, 1765, p. 25.

[3] *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, lib. I. cap. xvii. Coloniae Agrippinae, Demen, 1688, p. 87.

took up his staff and went out to meet him[1]; but nothing in the context or in the passage itself indicates with certainty that the staff was a crosier.

It would be an interesting point to enquire what relation the crosier of bishops may have to the ferules or staves which in the middle ages were in such frequent use in many churches. For example, in the twelfth century at Milan, a number of the officers of the church appear to have carried a ferule. Even the college of old men attached to this church carried wands[2]. And in another ancient church, with ancient customs, the church of Vienne in Dauphiny, Le Brun Desmaretes noticed at the end of the seventeenth century that on great festivals all the clergy, together with those who had the right to copes, with mitres on their heads and ferules in their hands, met the archbishop as he was coming into the church[3].

In Westminster Abbey there were found in the Inventory made 1388, or somewhat after, ten festival staves for use at Christmas. One was of ivory, five were whole, but four were broken[4].

Up to the present day the wardens of parish

[1] Amandus episcopus, accepto bacillo in manu sua, perrexit in occursum eius (Gregory of Tours, *De Gloria confessorum*, lib. XLV. Migne, *P. L.* LXXI. 862).

[2] *Beroldus, sive Ecclesiae Ambrosianae Mediolanensis Kalendarium et Ordines*, ed Marco Magistretti, Mediolani, Giovanola, 1894, pp. 35, 36.

[3] *Voyages liturgiques de France*,...par Le Sieur de Moleon, Paris, Delaulne, 1718, p. 29.

[4] *Archaeologia*, 1890, vol. LII. p. 277, cap. vi. "An inventory of the Vestry in Westminster Abbey, taken in 1388," ed. by J. Wickham Legg.

churches have assigned to them staves, which they carry in processions.

(g) Calceus patritius and Episcopal Sandals.

The *calceus patritius* or *senatorius* is dealt with at length by Monsieur Léon Heuzey, and explained by him with numerous figures taken from ancient statues[1]. As a part of court costume the use of buskins passed over to Byzantium. Thongs secure the sole of the *calceus* to the ankles. About this there appears to be nothing remarkable, but they suggest that the wearers belonged to the better classes, for they are not to be noticed in some of the representations of the sandals of the lower orders in Monsieur Heuzey's numerous reproductions. Thus when we have the thongs visible in the mosaics of Ravenna and Rome on the feet of the bishops and clerks, it is suggested by this appearance that the clergy belong to the upper classes of society.

It is uncertain if the sandals shown in the mosaics of Rome and Ravenna depict anything specially liturgical. But at the same time there is a considerable resemblance in the sandals worn by Maximianus and his clerks to the sandals of the consul seen in the consular diptychs.

After a time, the liturgical use of sandals by all

[1] Léon Heuzey, sub voce *calceus*, in Ch. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, Paris, Hachette, 1887, t. 1. partie ii. p. 817.

priests is enjoined in the Capitularies of Charles the Great:

CCCLXXI. Unusquisque Presbyter Missam ordine Romano cum sandaliis celebret[1].

In the days of Amalarius, special sandals worn in the church were common to bishops and priests as well as to deacons and subdeacons[2]. A later writer than Amalarius, Pseudo-Alcuin, who is often thought to be of the eleventh century, speaks of the sandals as "genus calceamenti, quo induuntur ministri ecclesiae[3]." They had not then been specialised to prelates.

Addendum.

It may be noticed in these reproductions how often the hands of emperors, senators, or consuls, are disposed in what is called the Western mode of blessing; the fourth and little fingers are bent into the palm, while the fore and middle fingers remain erect. There appears to be nothing Christian about this practice. Has it come down into the Western church from this civil or domestic fashion? The Greek disposition of the fingers may be also seen often enough in early Western drawings. Further, in the Sacramentary of Autun the bishop holds his hand in the way known in Italy as a preservative against the

[1] Stephanus Baluzius, *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, etc., Parisiis, Muguet, 1677, t. I. col. 903. Capit. lib. quintus.

[2] Amalarius, *de ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. II. cap. XXV. in M. Hittorp, *De divinis*, Paris, 1610, col. 393.

[3] Alcuin, *De divinis officiis*, in chapter *quid significent vestimenta* (Hittorp, *op. cit.* col. 274).

evil eye: that is, the ring and middle finger are flexed into the palm, while the little and fore fingers are extended[1]. I have been told by a student of Jewish ceremonial that this is the disposition of the hand when blessing in the Jewish synagogue. These arrangements of the hands and fingers and their possible connexion, or a common origin, may perhaps be worth attention by some student hereafter, though the limits indicated by the title of this work hinder the subject from being pursued in the present volume.

[1] See Léopold Delisle's reproduction in heliogravure of fol. 1 verso in *Gazette archéologique*, 1884.

CHAPTER VII

TABLION AND EPIGONATION

YEARS ago, when standing before the well-known mosaics of Justinian and Theodora in the church of St Vitalis at Ravenna, the question occurred to me: What are those quadrangular ornaments which the Emperor and the courtiers wear over the chlamys, on the right side? Are they something of the nature of a decoration, a distinction of the Cubicularii? The same shaped ornaments may be seen worn by the attendants of the Constantine in the mosaic at St Apollinaris *in Classe*; and at Rome by the soldier saints, Paulinianus, Telius, Antiochianus, and Caianus in the oratory of St Venantius, adjoining the Lateran. The ornament is spoken of by G. B. de Rossi as 'un segment carré que portait la milice palatine[1].' They may be also seen on the figures of Primus and Felicianus in St Stefano Rotondo.

This decoration is called the *tablion*[2]. The best

[1] G. B. de Rossi, *Musaici Cristiani...delle Chiese di Roma*, Roma, [1872?], Spithoever, fasc. xiii. Joseph Wilpert speaks of it: mit einem grossen rechteckigen *Einsatz*stück, welches tabula, *ταβλίον*, hiess. (*Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Koeln, Bachem, 1898, p. 27.

[2] I owe all the information that I have about the *tablion* in Byzantine times to the kindness of Mr G. McN. Rushforth.

Justinian and his courtiers: showing the Tablion

(Reproduction of a mosaic in the Church of St Vitalis at Ravenna, after a photograph taken by Signor P. Poppi of Bologna)

illustration of the *tablion* is most likely the famous mosaic of Justinian and his officers, at St Vitalis in Ravenna, of which mention has been made. But it may be found elsewhere, perhaps not so distinctly visible as in the mosaic. Two emperors and St Sergius, with others, wearing the *tablion* over the chlamys, are to be seen in the diptychs preserved in the cathedral church of Halberstadt[1]. Here the *tablion* is seen descending below the waist, reaching nearly to the knee, and is much larger than those seen in the mosaic at St Vitalis.

With a great deal of diffidence in my own knowledge, I yet hesitate to accept the opinion of Monsignor Wilpert[2] that the patch figured by Padre Garrucci[3] is a *tablion*; for all others have been depicted on the right side, and this patch is on the left. Monsignor Wilpert regards it as the earliest representation of the *tablion* known to him. I venture to think it seems more like a square bag, carried in the left hand.

The *tablion* is not often seen as a distinction for women. In the two cases that I have noticed it has been a decoration of empresses[4].

If it be not yet clearly made out to whom the right of wearing the *tablion* was given, yet it may be

[1] Ormonde M. Dalton, *Archaeologia*, 1900, vol. LVII. pp. 162 and 164. See also by the same author, *Byzantine Art and Archaeology*, Oxford, 1911, p. 196.

[2] Joseph Wilpert, *op. cit.* p. 27, note 3.

[3] Raffaele Garrucci, *Storia della Arte Cristiana* etc., Prato, Guasti, 1880, vol. VI. tav. 495. 1.

[4] O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art* etc., figg. 128 and 139. Em. Molinier, *Histoire générale des Arts appliqués*, etc., Paris, Levy, 1896, t. I. p. 97, and Planche V. No. 3, opposite p. 58.

said that it certainly appears as a mark of great distinction, worn by emperors and officers high in the imperial service.

The *tablion* which is seen in the mosaics of St Vitalis at Ravenna, hanging on the right side of Justinian and of his courtiers, bears a very strong resemblance to the *epigonation*, a distinctive ornament worn by prelates of the Greek Church, and which we see in use early in Church history. The likeness is so marked as to suggest the question whether the *tablion* be not the forerunner of the ecclesiastical ornament.

The *epigonation* is depicted in the Menologium of Basil II, but is only partly visible between the fore and hinder folds of the chasuble of a bishop under the right arm, upon the linen of the alb. The drawing is considered by Pater Braun to be of the ninth century[1]. It may also be seen, less concealed, in the mosaics of bishops of the twelfth century in the cathedral church of Cefalù and many other churches in Sicily. In these representations it accords very well in its position with that of the *tablion* in the mosaics of Ravenna and elsewhere. Later on it becomes wholly visible, not at all hidden by the chasuble, and thus by little and little it leaves the place taken by the *tablion*, though still on the right side of the wearer, but at a lessening distance from the ground.

It may be observed that amongst the Easterns

[1] "Miniatur im Menologium Basilius II. Rom Vatikan." (Joseph Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1907, p. 236, fig. 110.)

there are two varieties of the *epigonation*, both limited to dignified clergymen; one is rectangular, fringed at the lower border which is horizontal; and worn on the right side of the priest or archpriest to whom it has been granted; it hangs from the girdle. The other is lozenge-shaped, and worn also on the right side of the bishop who claims it as an ensign of his office[1]. It thus appears that the *epigonation* of bishops is allied in shape to the *tablion* which is rhomboidal, more than to the *epigonation* of the archpriests and lesser dignified clergy, which is right angled. And the episcopal *epigonation* points its lowest angle to the ground in a way that is not unlike what we see at Ravenna.

P. Braun does not consider the word *epigonation* to be earlier than Theodore Balsamon, and he thinks that the same ornament was called by the name *eucheirion* in the eleventh century[2]; though he depicts the thing as in existence in the ninth century[3].

Addendum.

After these pages had been written some months I found a confirmation of my opinion of the descent of the *epigonation* from a Byzantine decoration in a Russian treatise on the Divine Liturgy, translated into German:

Das rechteckige Epigonation (russisch: Nebedrennik) und das rautenförmige Epigonation (die

[1] Michael Rajewsky, *Euchologion der Orthodox-katholischen Kirche*, Wien, Zamarski, 1861, Th. I. pp. xxviii and xxxi.

[2] *op. cit.* p. 551.

[3] *op. cit.* fig. 110.

Paliza). Vor Zeiten trugen Personen, welche in den Kriegsheeren und kaiserlichen Palästen wichtigen Aemtern vorstanden, an der Hüfte Schwerter verschiedener Art und unter denselben Kniestücke ebenfalls verschiedener Art, die Epigonatien und Palizen. Die griechischen Kaiser, nachdem sie Christen geworden waren, gaben den Bischöfen und einigen Priestern das Recht, dieselben ohne Schwert zu tragen; auf solche Weise kamen sie in die Zahl der kirchlichen Bekleidungen, als Ehrenzeichen (Dimitrij Sokolow, *Darstellung des Gottesdienstes der orthodox-katholischen Kirche des Morgenlandes*, Berlin, Siegismund, 1893, p. 27, translated into German by Georgij Morosow, chaplain at the Russian Court Chapel in Stuttgart).

In English this would be like:

'There is the rectangular and the lozenge-shaped Epigonation. Formerly those who filled important offices in the Army or Imperial Household carried swords on their hips of different kinds, and below these had different epigonatia. The Byzantine emperors, after becoming Christians, gave the Bishops and certain Priests the right to wear these though without the sword, and it was in this way that they passed into the number of ecclesiastical vestments as marks of dignity.'

The writer thinks, as I have ventured to suggest, that the *epigonation* is a decoration conferred upon ecclesiastics by the Greek Emperors. But he does not connect it with the *tablion*, and rather thinks the decoration arose as an addition to the sword; but

this is commonly worn on the left side, while the *tablion* and *epigonation* always appear on the right. And the *tablion* is known to have been early conferred upon women, to whom swords do not seem suitable.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ENCOLPION AND THE PECTORAL CROSS OF BISHOPS

It seems hardly likely that at the present day the opinion of Innocent the Third upon the source of the episcopal pectoral cross will find many to support it. He connects the modern pectoral cross with the lamina of gold which the Jewish High Priest wore on his forehead[1]; which now ceasing, the Christian High Priest wears the cross on his breast[2]. But at this moment there appear to be other opinions held about the source of the episcopal pectoral cross. An opinion favoured in the new edition of Thalhofer's *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie*[3] is that the pectoral cross of bishops is derived from the *bulla* which was hung round the neck of young persons, mostly boys, as a protection from evil influences. What these *bullae* contained is not well known; those worn in the upper classes of society were of gold[4], of lead in the lower.

[1] See Exodus xxviii. 36.

[2] Innocent III. *De sacro altaris mysterio*, lib. I. cap. lii. (Sylvae-Ducum, Verhoeven, 1846, p. 71).

[3] Valentin Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie*, ed. Ludwig Eisenhofer, Freiburg im Br., Herder, 1912, Bd I. p. 575.

[4] Joannes Scheffer thinks the *bulla* was always hollow and may have sometimes contained an amulet (*De antiquorum torquibus*, cap. v. in J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*, Lugd. Bat., Vander AA., 1699, XII. 922–3).

Pliny might be interpreted as thinking that it was the gold that was the protection against harm[1]. The *bulla* was worn by girls, and also ceremonially, it may be noted, by old men, and generals on the day of their triumph, as Plutarch records[2].

But the weight of authority seems to incline to the older view that the pectoral cross of bishops really takes its origin in human affection. It is a practice almost universal for us to keep in a locket hung round our necks something once part of a dear friend. This locket was called by the Greeks *encolpion*, because it was worn against the chest; and it may be easy to imagine that in Christian times such a locket was common to all classes of Christians, clerks and laymen, as well as women and children. Early in the centuries the practice underwent a further developement, for the Christians began to collect the relics of the saints, and to wear them in their bosoms. Prudentius speaks of it in these lines:

> Sanctorum cinerum dicata dona
> Aut gestare sinu fidele pignus[3].

St Jerome does not quite approve of a similar practice with fragments of the Gospels, of the wood of the cross, and like objects.

[1] C. Plinii Secundi, *Nat. Hist.* cap. xxxiii. 4, and 25 (ed. D. Detlefsen, Berolini, 1873, vol. v. pp. 37, 52).

[2] Plutarch, *Lives*, *Romulus*, § 25, *sub fine* (ed. Theod. Doehner, Paris, Didot, 1846, i. 39).

[3] Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, vi. ll. 134 and 135. (Migne, *P. L.* lx. 421).

Hoc apud nos superstitiosae mulierculae, in parvulis Evangeliis, et in crucis ligno...usque hodie factitant[1].

It is likely that if the relic were part of the true cross, the receptacle worn round the neck would take on the shape of a cross, and this wearing of a cross was, as Cardinal Bona remarks[2], common to Christian men and women. There was nothing clerical about it. A receptacle for relics was worn also by Kings and Emperors. In 869, the Emperor at Constantinople, as a mark of favour, put upon the neck of the vicar of the Eastern Churches, not a bishop, the *encolpion* which he himself was wearing[3].

In 1000, when Otto III. disturbed the tomb of Charles the Great, he found a golden cross hanging from the neck of the Emperor[4].

In like manner a cross and chain were found in the tomb of King Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey during the reign of King James the Second[5]. Naturally, similar crosses or lockets have

[1] St Jerome, *Comment. in Matt.*, lib. IV. cap. xxiii. (Migne, *P.L.* xxvi. 168).

[2] Ioan. Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo*, ed. Robert Sala, I. cap. xxiv. § x. Aug. Taurinorum, 1749, t. II. p. 243. Even as late as the middle of the eighteenth century, Dominico Georgi, the well-known writer on the liturgy of the Roman Pontiff, inclines to the opinion that the pectoral cross is not to be included amongst the episcopal ensigns. (*De liturgia Romani Pontificis*, lib. I. cap. xix. § vii. Romae, Bernabo, 1731, t. I. p. 155.)

[3] Labbe and Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, Lut. Par. 1671, t. VIII. col. 1041.

[4] Thietmari *Chronicon*, § 29. (Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Hannoverae, Hahn, 1839. Scriptorum t. III. p. 781.)

[5] [Henry Keepe,] *A true and perfect Narrative of the strange and Unexpected finding the Crucifix & Gold-Chain of that pious*

been found in the tombs of bishops as well. There is a noteworthy instance in the account of the opening of the tomb of St Gregory the Great, written by John the Deacon; we find mentioned as hanging from the neck "reliquiarum phylacteria tenui argento fabricata[1]."

In this country also crosses have been found in the sepulchres of bishops. For instance, in the tomb of St Birinus was found, among other things, a leaden cross[2]; and in the tomb of St Cuthbert a golden cross[3], lying on the breasts of the bishops. But in England, at least, the cross does not seem to have been counted among the episcopal ensigns. The lists of English episcopal ensigns that we have do not include the pectoral cross. This is the outcome of the attention paid to this point during the last thirty years by Sir William St John Hope.

And a pioneer in these studies in England, the late Dr Rock, held much the same opinions. He says under the heading of the Reliquary worn about the neck:

What is now rightly known under the title of the bishop's pectoral cross, was, strictly speaking, never among

prince, St Edward the King and Confessor, which was found after 620 *years interment: and presented to his most sacred Majesty, King James the Second.* By Charles Taylour, Gent. London, Randal Taylor, 1688.

[1] John the Deacon, *Vita S. Gregorii Magni*, lib. IV. cap. lxxx. (Migne, *P.L.* LXXV. col. 228.)

[2] L. Surius, *De vitis Sanctorum*, Venetiis, 1581, t. VI. fo. 220. Decem. 4.

[3] James Raine (the elder), *Saint Cuthbert*, Durham, Andrews, 1828, p. 211.

an English prelate's liturgical appurtenances according to St Osmund's rite for his church of Salisbury ; and in all likelihood the use of this ornament, as it is now worn over the chasuble, began in those countries which adopted the Roman pontifical, only after the fall of the Catholic Church in this kingdom[1].

What needs to be impressed upon the minds of those interested in the use of pectoral crosses is that they are private and particular ornaments. Catalani, a writer of the middle of the eighteenth century, reports it as held by an advocate in the Roman Courts that the pectoral cross was a civil ensign belonging to the bishop, not a sacred[2].

Something akin to the pectoral cross of bishops was noticed at the Abbey of Vasor by Martène and Durand in their journey through the Low Countries in the first quarter of the eighteenth century :

Il nous fit voir un cristal de roche orné de pierres précieuses, sur lequel on voit l'histoire de Susanne très finement gravée, à ce qu'on prétent†, par S. Eloi, sur lequel on lit *Lotharius rex Francorum me fieri jussit.* Autrefois les abbés le portoient sur leur poitrine lorsqu'ils officioient[3].

[1] Daniel Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, London, Dolman, 1849, vol. II. p. 181.

[2] See Joseph Catalani, *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, Commentariis illustratum, lib. I. § iii. comment. v. Parisiis, Jouby, 1860, t. I. p. 549. Catalani rejects the opinion that the pectoral cross is a civil ensign of the bishop (*op. cit.* p. 549), but it may be observed that Ioannes Molanus (*de Historia SS. Imaginum et Pectiorarum*, Lovanii, typ. Academ. 1771, p. 560 note) reports that the canons of Tournay some twenty years before he wrote had had granted to them by the most August Empress, i.e. Maria Theresa, the Empress-Queen, the right to wear the pectoral cross.

[3] [Edm. Martène and Ur. Durand,] *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins*, Paris, Montalant, 1724, partie iii. p. 132.

But it may be observed that the ornament is neither a cross nor a relic, and yet it is worn by the abbot while he is in the divine service.

There is, however, some small evidence that English bishops wore round the neck a box containing relics. In the Pontifical of Edmund Lacy, Bishop of Exeter from 1420 to 1455, on what appears to be the first folio where the rubric beginning *Modus induendi Episcopum* is set forth, the inferior ministers, after having brought a towel and water for the washing of the bishop's hands, are directed thus :

Postea exuat capam et induat amictum, albam, et stolam et reliquias circa collum, ac deinceps, tunicam, de hinc dalmaticam, et manipulum[1].

Mr Chancellor Pryke, at the suggestion of the Rev. J. N. Dalton, Canon of Windsor, sends me most courteously the information that "the words *et reliquias circa collum* are in the original, and are in the same handwriting as the rest of the passage."

There is a copy of the first edition of Cranmer's Bible in the British Museum, the frontispiece of which has been coloured by some hand; and all the three bishops who stand on the right of King Henry VIII. have golden chains round their necks. As hanging from two of these chains are depicted little golden boxes which would take just such a place as the box of relics might take if the directions of the rubric of the Exeter Pontifical had been followed. The shelf mark of this copy is C. 18. d. 14. Another copy of

[1] Ralph Barnes, *Liber Pontificalis of Edmund Lacy, Bishop of Exeter*, Exeter, Roberts, 1847, p. 3.

the same edition has no colour on the frontispiece at all. Its shelf mark is C. 18. d. 3.

An *encolpion* or pectoral cross without relics is not an *encolpion* or pectoral cross at all. The pectoral cross is essentially a portable reliquary; and the prayer said by the Roman prelate when putting on the pectoral cross speaks to this day of its being filled with relics: "hanc Crucem Sanctorum tuorum reliquiis refertam[1]." It is allowed by Roman Catholic writers, such as Father Herbert Thurston, that

> as a liturgical cross, and part of the ordinary episcopal insignia, the pectoral cross is of quite modern date.

And later on the same writer says of the pectoral cross:

> Its use seems to have been introduced during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries[2].

In the last century there seems to have been an inclination amongst certain bishops in communion with the Roman Pontiff to make the pectoral cross an ensign of local or particular jurisdiction. For instance, a bishop leaving his own diocese would conceal his

[1] *Missale Romanum ... Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum*, Romae, Desclée, 1911, p. lii. Orationes dicendae cum sacerdos induitur, etc. This prayer appears in the edition of the Pian Missal of 1572 (Antwerp, Plantin) and the pectoral cross is spoken of in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, Romae, 1600, lib. II. cap. viii. p. 155.

[2] Herbert Thurston, *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, New York, Appleton [about 1908], vol. IV. p. 534, under *Pectoral Cross*. This statement may need modification in view of what Durandus has said in his *Pontificale* of the use of a pectoral cross by bishops in his time (printed by Edm. Martene, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, lib. I. cap. iv. art. xii. Ordo xxii. Antuerpiae, de la Bry, 1736, t. I. col. 613 c) and of the quotations from authorised Roman books just above.

pectoral cross, but on meeting the bishop in whose diocese the stranger bishop chanced to be, the bishop of the place would salute the new comer, and drawing out the pectoral cross leave it openly hanging from the neck in front of the chest. This custom appears to have been checked by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which allows the bishop to wear the pectoral cross uncovered wherever he may be: while the question whether the pectoral cross could be worn over the sacred vestments, so that at least the *flocculus* might be seen, is answered in the negative. So that the pectoral cross is not to be visible during the sacred offices; nor anything pertaining to the cross. Thus the view now prevailing at Rome seems to be that the pectoral cross of bishops is not an episcopal ensign, but a personal decoration. Unlike ring and staff, the pectoral cross is not delivered to the bishop elect during the actual rite of consecration; but he assumes the pectoral cross at his own altar when the chasuble and other ornaments are put on, while he is reciting the preparatory psalms, before the Mass of consecration[1].

A recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites has been published, by which the bishop is allowed to wear the pectoral cross wherever he may be, but not to allow it to be visible during sacred offices[2].

[1] *Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII*, etc. de consecratione Electi in Episcopum, Antverpiae, Plantin, 1765, p. 71.

[2] *Decreta authentica Congregationis Sacrorum Rituum ex actis eiusdem collecta*, Romae, de propaganda fide, 1900, vol. III. p. 366. No. 4035. Die Iunii 1899.

The practice of showing the episcopal pectoral cross openly upon the chasuble seems to have been known in the time of Andrew de Saussay[1].

And the same appears in Germany; for Dr Bock's illustration of a bishop in full pontificals shows distinctly enough the pectoral cross on the chasuble[2].

Dr Rock speaks of its appearance on the chasuble in the paragraph quoted above; so that the practice may have been widespread, though now forbidden.

The pectoral cross of bishops is a noteworthy example of what may be seen more or less often in the history of other ecclesiastical ornaments. It will look to many as if there were little doubt that the pectoral cross began as a locket or box containing some relic of a saint, and worn indifferently by any Christian man, woman, or child. We find the ornament worn by Kings and Emperors and also by Bishops and Roman Pontiffs; but later in time, it becomes, by little and little, a badge of the highest grade in the Christian ministry, and attempts are made to convert it into a symbol of jurisdiction.

This gradual restriction to one order of the ministry of ornaments once common to all Christian folk may be seen in others besides the pectoral cross. It may be illustrated from the history of the chasuble[3]; which however does not appear in such universal use

[1] Andreas de Saussay, *Panoplia Episcopalis*, Lut. Par. 1666, Lib. IV. p. 296.

[2] Fr. Bock, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters*, Bonn, Cohen, 1866, Bd II. Taf. xxxi. fig. 1.

[3] See pp. 83 f.

among Christian people as the pectoral cross. First the chasuble becomes a liturgical vestment; and is then limited to the clergy. It is worn by the acolytes in the papal or pontifical procession of *Ordo Romanus Primus*[1], which good judges like Mr Edmund Bishop think sets forth the Roman ceremonial of the sixth century[2]. After a time the chasuble appears to be restricted to those in sacred orders, subdeacons, deacons, and those above these orders. From the tenth century the bishop has, when ordaining priests, called the chasuble the *vestis sacerdotalis*[3], though even now it is not exclusively worn by priests and bishops; for in times of fasting and prayer, at which ancient usages, laid aside at other times of the year, are sometimes found to linger, it is still worn by the deacon and subdeacon as the *planeta plicata*. Notwithstanding all these phases in its history, the chasuble is still looked upon both by the Puritan and the Ultramontane as the special vestment of the priesthood which indicates sacrifice.

There is also another instance of a like development. The mitre, like the pectoral cross, late in making its appearance amongst the episcopal insignia, was not always limited to prelates. When the canons of a church now wear the episcopal ensigns it is commonly pleaded that they do so by papal privilege, and a claim is made that thereby they show that

[1] J. Mabillon, *Musei Italici*, t. II. Lutec. Paris. 1724, p. 6, § 5.

[2] Edmund Bishop, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, second edition, 1902. London, F. E. Robinson, p. 16.

[3] H. A. Wilson, *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert* Henry Bradshaw Society, 1903, p. 124.

they share the bishop's authority. Those who have travelled in southern Italy and in Sicily are surprised at the number of churches the members of which wear at least the mitre. Is this always due to papal privilege, or is it only long continued custom, so old that its origin is lost in the twilight of history?

Le Brun Desmaretes gives an abstract of the Ordinary of the Church of Vienne in Dauphigny which is of the year 1524, and he notes that at the vespers of great festivals, such as Easter, the clergy and chanters who wear copes go to meet the Archbishop processionally with their mitres on their heads[1].

Martène and Durand found in their visit to Lyons early in the eighteenth century that the subdeacon wore the mitre at the cathedral church; and a monument at St Irenaeus' showed a canon wearing a mitre[2]. Le Brun Desmaretes at his visit in 1696 reports that the deacon and subdeacon at Lyons had the mitre[3].

Here we have the practice of two very ancient and important churches, Lyons and Vienne, of which it was boasted that each *nescit novitates*. But even at a comparatively unimportant church, that of Mâcon, Martène found that at vespers the celebrant and the chanters wore mitres, and at high mass the celebrant,

[1] [Le Brun-Desmaretes,] *Voyages liturgiques de France*...par Le Sieur de Moleon, Paris, Delaulne, 1718, p. 29.

[2] [Edm. Martène and Ursin Durand,] *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins*, etc. Paris, 1717, partie i. pp. 236 and 237.

[3] Le Brun-Desmaretes, *op. cit.* pp. 52, 53.

the deacon, subdeacon, and the two chanters also wore mitres[1].

Charles Barthélemy, the commentator on Durandus, opens his note on the mitre with the remark that it is an ancient headdress, common to all nations and to women as well as men[2]. This statement he bases upon a remark of J. B. Thiers[3]. Barthélemy thinks the mitre was worn inside and outside the church, even during meals, though now restricted to ecclesiastical functions. But at the end of the eighteenth century its use had become restricted to bishops and certain abbots; though there were even then instances of its use by chanters and choristers.

It would seem that papal permission has been given for the use of the mitre by laymen. One by Alexander the Second to Wratislaus, Duke of Bohemia; and another by Innocent the Second to the son of Roger, Count of Sicily. They are recorded by J. B. Thiers[4]. Both instances are found very early in the history of the mitre.

Again: we may consider the history of the episcopal sandals. Sandals, which are now worn only by prelates, were early in Christian times common to all clerks[5]. The maniple, in its predecessor the *mappula*, is claimed by a learned Italian writer as the cloth which the first Christians and priests carried

[1] Martène and Durand, *op. cit.* partie i. p. 233.

[2] Charles Barthélemy, *Rational ou Manuel des divins offices de Guillaume Durand*, Paris, Vivès, 1854, t. i. p. 437.

[3] J. B. Thiers, *Histoire des Perruques*, Paris, 1690, p. 63.

[4] J. B. Thiers, *op. cit.* p. 79.

[5] See above, p. 71.

in their left hands for the purpose of the modern handkerchief[1].

This want of determination in the early assignment of ornaments which may hereafter become so highly specialised would seem to point to a moment in their history when modern ideas as to the significance of the decoration had not come into being.

The history of Church ornaments shows that it is often so long before they become specialised that no idea of their present use could have been in the minds of those who introduced them. They begin as instruments used in domestic or civil economy, and only by little and little are they confined to certain determined uses. When they are first brought into the service of the Church there is no symbolism about them ; and it may be repeated that no more symbolism can be ascribed to Church ornaments to-day than they had when first employed. The historian must endeavour not to be influenced by traditional teaching.

[1] Tobias Corona, *Sacri Tempii*, Roma, Fei [1625?], p. 598 c.

INDEX

[*See also Table of Contents, p. x.*]

Abacus, 13, 15
Abu Sargah, church at, 61
Æthelwold, benedictional of, 61
Alb, 26, 54
Alphabet, ceremony of the, in consecration of churches, 7 *n.*
Altar, origin of form of, 15
Amalarius, on chasuble, 39; on sandals, 72
Atchley, Cuthbert, on the use of incense, 19
Athanasius, St, 20
Atrium, 4
Augustine, St, his teachers, 24; on *tunica*, 55. See Ps.-Augustine
Autun, sacramentary of, 68, 72

Balteus, 63
Barbier de Montault, 40
Bartholinus, B., his tract *de paenula*, 31, 49
Barthélemy, Ch., on mitre, 91
Basil II, *menologium* of, 76
Basilica, form of, 5; origin of Christian, 5
Bayeux tapestry, 38, 64
Benedict, St, 61
Birinus, St, 83
Bishops, officials of empire, 2
Blaise, St, vestments in abbey of, 34
Bock, Dr Fr., 88
Bona, cardinal, on chasuble, 11; on cross, 82; on symbolism, 11
Book, on *abacus* and altar, 16
Braun, J., on vestments, 10, 12, 33, 34, 42, 44, 76, 77
Brightman, F. E., 16; on Eastern chasuble, 37, 47; on Sakkos, 57
Brown, Baldwin, on form of churches, 4
Bulla, 80
Bunsen, C. C. J., 6
Buskins, 12, 71

Calceus patritius, 71
Candles, on *abacus* and altar, 15, 16
Canterbury, book on altar at, 17
Cefalù, mosaics at, 59, 76
Celestine I, on episcopal dress, 27, 30
Censer, 19
Chalice, forms of, 3
Chapels Royal, books on altar in the, 18
Charles the Great, 72, 82

Chasuble, derived from *paenula*, 24; not from *toga*, 28; by whom worn, 12, 32, 39, 41, 89; shaped like cope, 34, 35; other forms of, 36, 37, 41. See also Paenula
Churchwardens, 70
Cicero, 24, 30
Cluny, choir boys at, 65
Colobium, 55
Colours, signification of, 1
Constantine, legislation of, 2
Convocation of Canterbury, Report on Ornaments, 48
Cope, 32; derived from *paenula*, 32, 46; from *lacerna*, 48; when first developed, 44; use in Armenia, 47. See also Paenula
Courby, M., 28
Crosier, 66
Cross, pectoral. See Pectoral Cross
Cuthbert, St, 61; tomb of, 83
Cyril, St, of Alexandria, 20

Dalmatic, 56; by whom worn, 57
Daniel, H. A., 43
Desmaretes, Le Brun, 70, 90
Diocese, 3
Diptychs, consular, 52 f.
Duchesne, Mgr, on the *atrium*, 4
Durandus, his symbolism, 9
Durant, J. S., 65
Durham, book on altar at, 17

Edmund, St, Abp of Canterbury, 37
Edward the Confessor, 82
Encolpion, 81
Epigonation, 76; two kinds of, 77–8

Ferules, 70
Fingers, position of the, 72
Fortescue, Dr A., 17; on chasuble, 28; on cope, &c., 46; on maniple, 66; on toga, 29
Frederick the Great, 43
Freeman, E. A., on basilica, 6

Gerbert, Dom M., 34
German fashions in Rome, 26
Girdle, 63
Globe, on bishop's staff, 68
Gospels, book of, on altar, 16, 17
Gothic fashions, 25
Gregory the Great, 54, 61, 64; tomb of, 83
Gregory, St, of Tours, 69

Halberstadt, diptychs at, 75
Handkerchief, 63, 64, 92
Heider, Dr Gustav, 35
Heuzey, L., 71
Hildesheim, vestments at, 35
Honorius, legislation of, 2, 26
Hope, Sir W. St J., 83

Incense, 19, 20
Innocent III, 80
Isidore of Seville, on ring, 21; on chasuble, 33; on staff, 66

Jerome, St, 81
Justinian and Theodora, mosaics of, 74, 76

Kidd, Dr B. J., 25, 28

Lacy, Bishop Edm., pontifical of, 85
Laud, Abp, 9
Le Brun, P., 46
Leclercq, H., on origin of Christian basilica, 6; symbolism, 9; on cope, 32

Lemaire, Abbé, on origin of Christian basilica, 5
Leviticus, vestments, etc., derived from, 10
Lex mandatorum, 15
Liber Pontificalis, 57, 64
Lights, ceremonial and portable, 19, 20
Lituus, 66, 69
Lockhart, W., on chasuble, 47
Lyons, church of, 90

Mâcon, church of, 90; council of, 62
Malachi, St, Archbishop of Armagh, 62
Maniple, 63; *the* Eucharistic vestment, 66
Mappa, 27, 63
Mappula, 60, 91
Marquardt, on Vestis triumphalis, 53
Martène, Edm., and Durand, Ursin, their *Voyage littéraire*, 37, 65, 84, 90
Maximianus, 37, 56, 71
Martin, Arthur, 67
Melchisedec, 44, 45
Michael, St, 40, 61, 67
Micklethwaite, Mr, 17
Middleton, Conyers, his *Letter from Rome*, 8
Milan, church of, 70
Mitres, worn by others than bishops, 12, 89, 90
Montault, Barbier de, 40, 41

Neale, J. M., on maniple, 65
Notitia dignitatum, 14; Christian altar suggested by *abacus* in, 15

Omophorion, 58; by whom worn, 62
Ordo Romanus primus, 20, 39, 89; ordo rom. VI, 39
Otto III, 82
Oxford, Christ Church, books on altar at, 17

Paenula, shape of, 23; by whom worn, 24; two kinds of, 30, 36, 46; hooded, 33, 47; in Russia and the East, 41, 47–9; Lutherans, 42, 43. See also Chasuble
Pallium or Pall, 58; by whom worn, 62; in Ireland, 62
Pallium linostimum, 64
Pantheon, consecration of the, 7
Parenzo, mosaics at, 45
Pastoral staff, derived from *scipio* or *lituus*, 66
Paten, forms of, 3
Pila, 15
Planeta, 34
Planeta plicata, 60, 89. See also Paenula
Pectoral cross, 12, 80; a civil ensign, 84; date of introduction, 86; not in use in England, 84, 85; a personal decoration, 87; restrictions in the use of, 88
Pontigny, chasuble at, 37
Præfectus Annonæ, 26
Præfectus Prætorio, 2, 13, 15
Presbyterium, 4
Primus and Felicianus, SS., 74
Province, 3
Prudentius, on relics, 81
Pseudo-Alcuin, 72
Pseudo-Augustine, 57

Rationale, 10
Ravenna, frescoes and mosaics at, 37, 39, 43–5, 56, 71, 74–6
Reliquary, portable, 83, 85, 86
Restriction in the use of ornaments, 88

Ring, 21, 22
Rites, Congregation of, 41, 87
Robert, Archbishop, benedictional of, 68
Rochet, 55
Rock, Dr, 83, 88
Roger, count of Sicily, 91
Rohault, Ch., 39
Rohault de Fleury, on chasuble, 28; on crosier, 69
Rome, church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, 7; S. Maria antiqua, 5; St Mary Major, 44, 45; St Clement, 61, 64; chapel of St Venantius, 74; St Stefano Rotondo, 74
Rossi, G. B. de, 1, 26, 56, 74
Rushforth, G. McN., on origin of churches, 5; on *vestis triumphalis*, 53; on *scipio*, 67

Sakkos, 56
Sandals, 71, 91
Saussay, A. du, on origin of vestments, 11
Scarf, of consuls, origin of, 59, 60
Scipio eburneus, 66
Sergius, St, 75
Severinus, St, 69
Stigand, archbishop, 38, 64 *n.*
Strabo, Walafrid, on vesture of ministers, 27
Surplice, 41, 55, 56
Sylvester I, pope, 57, 64

Tablinum, 4
Tablion, 74–76
Templum sacrae urbis, consecration of, 7
Thalhofer, V., 80
Theodosius, sumptuary laws of, 25, 59, 63
Thiers, J. B., 91
Thomas Aquinas, St, 65
Thurston, H., 86
Toga, 28; shape of, 30; folded, 59, 60; toga picta, 56
Tonsure, 3
Tunica, forms of, 56
Tunica palmata, 54
Tunicle, 58

Ursin, St, abbey of (Bourges), 37

Vasor, abbey of, 84
Vert, C. de, 65
Vestis triumphalis, 52
Vestments, origin of, 1, 10, 12
Vienne, church of, 70, 90
Viollet-le-Duc, 32

Westminster Abbey, 70
Wilpert, Mgr, 59; on tablion, 75
Wiltheim, A., 58
Winchester, books on altar at, 17
Windsor, St George's, books on altar at, 17
Wratislaus, Duke of Bohemia, 91

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CAMBRIDGE HANDBOOKS OF LITURGICAL STUDY

General Editors:

H. B. Swete, D.D., and J. H. Srawley, D.D.

The Ancient Church Orders. By Arthur John Maclean, D.D., Hon. D.D. (Glasgow), Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness. Small crown 8vo. 4s net.

The Church Year and Kalendar. By John Dowden, D.D., Hon. LL.D. (Edinburgh), late Bishop of Edinburgh. Small crown 8vo. 4s net.

The Early History of the Liturgy. By J. H. Srawley, D.D., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield. Small crown 8vo. 6s net.

The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation. By T. Thompson, M.A. Small crown 8vo. 6s net.

Coronation Rites. By Reginald Maxwell Woolley, B.D., Rector and Vicar of Minting, Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln. With 4 plates. Crown 8vo. 5s net.

SELECTION FROM THE GENERAL CATALOGUE OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Liturgy of the Primitive Church. By R. M. Woolley, B.D. Crown 8vo. 5s net.

Early Latin Hymnaries. An index of Hymns in Hymnaries before 1100. With an appendix from later sources. By James Mearns, M.A., Vicar of Rushden, Buntingford. With a frontispiece. Demy 8vo. 5s net.

The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in Early and Medieval Times. By the same author. With 3 plates. Demy 8vo. 6s net.

English Monasteries. By A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A., F.S.A. With 16 illustrations. Royal 16mo. Cloth, 1s 3d net. Leather, 2s 6d net. Cambridge Manuals Series.

The Ground Plan of the English Parish Church. By A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A., F.S.A. With 17 figures. Royal 16mo. Cloth, 1s 3d net. Leather, 2s 6d net. Cambridge Manuals Series.

The Historical Growth of the English Parish Church. By the same author. With 19 figures. Royal 16mo. Cloth, 1s 3d net. Leather, 2s 6d net. Cambridge Manuals Series.

Notes and Documents relating to Westminster Abbey.

No. 1. The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., and M. R. James, Litt.D. Royal 8vo. 5s net.

No. 2. The History of Westminster Abbey by John Flete. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. Royal 8vo. 5s net.

No. 3. Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster. A Study of the Abbey under Norman rule. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. With frontispiece. Royal 8vo. 5s net.

No. 4. The Abbot's House at Westminster. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. With plate and 3 plans. Royal 8vo. 5s net.

No. 5. The Monks of Westminster. Being a Register of the Brethren of the Convent from the Time of the Confessor to the Dissolution. With Lists of the Obedientiaries and an Introduction. By E. H. Pearce, M.A., Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster. Large royal 8vo. 10s net.

Brasses. By J. S. M. Ward, B.A., F.R.Hist.S. With 24 figures. Royal 16mo. Cloth, 1s 3d net. Leather, 2s 6d net. Cambridge Manuals Series.

Ancient Stained and Painted Glass. By F. S. Eden. With 27 illustrations. Royal 16mo. Cloth, 1s 3d net. Leather, 2s 6d net. Cambridge Manuals Series.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Fetter Lane, London: C. F. Clay, Manager

Date Due

JA 3 - '56

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01023 9228